S. HRG. 101-169

# SCENIC BYWAYS STUDY ACT OF 1989

## HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER RESOURCES,
TRANSPORTATION, AND INFRASTRUCTURE

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON
ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS
UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED FIRST CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

## S. 432

A BILL TO DIRECT THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION TO IDENTIFY SCENIC AND HISTORIC ROADS AND TO DEVELOP METHODS OF DESIGNATING, PROMOTING, PROTECTING, AND ENHANCING ROADS AS SCENIC AND HISTORIC ROADS

JUNE 9, 1989

Printed for the use of the
Committee on Environment and Public Works

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
20-549 WASHINGTON : 1989

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

S321-28

## COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

QUENTIN N. BURDICK, North Dakota, *Chairman*

DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN, New York
GEORGE J. MITCHELL, Maine
MAX BAUCUS, Montana
FRANK R. LAUTENBERG, New Jersey
JOHN B. BREAUX, Louisiana
HARRY REID, Nevada
BOB GRAHAM, Florida
JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN, Connecticut

JOHN H. CHAFEE, Rhode Island
ALAN K. SIMPSON, Wyoming
STEVE SYMMS, Idaho
DAVE DURENBERGER, Minnesota
JOHN W. WARNER, Virginia
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
GORDON J. HUMPHREY, New Hampshire

David M. Strauss, *Staff Director*
Robert F. Hurley, *Minority Staff Director*

---

### Subcommittee on Water Resources, Transportation, and Infrastructure

DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN, *Chairman*

GEORGE J. MITCHELL, Maine
FRANK R. LAUTENBERG, New Jersey
JOHN B. BREAUX, Louisiana
HARRY REID, Nevada
BOB GRAHAM, Florida
JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN, Connecticut

STEVE SYMMS, Idaho
JOHN W. WARNER, Virginia
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
GORDON J. HUMPHREY, New Hampshire
DAVE DURENBERGER, Minnesota
JOHN H. CHAFEE, Rhode Island

# CONTENTS

## OPENING STATEMENTS

Page

Burdick, Hon. Quentin N., U.S. Senator from the State of North Dakota .......... 18

Moynihan, Hon. Daniel Patrick, U.S. Senator from the State of New York .......... 1

Reid, Hon. Harry, U.S. Senator from the State of Nevada .......... 16

Symms, Hon. Steve, U.S. Senator from the State of Idaho .......... 1

Warner, Hon. John W., U.S. Senator from the Commonwealth of Virginia .......... 10

## WITNESSES

Archer, John, managing director, government affairs, American Automobile Association .......... 35
- Written statement .......... 97

Heat-Moon, William Least, representing Scenic America .......... 17
- Written statement .......... 48
- Responses to additional questions from:
  - Senator Burdick .......... 59
  - Senator Symms .......... 66

Lydston, Hugh, chief of transportation services, Idaho Department of Transportation .......... 33

Mitchell, Teresa, executive director, Seaway Trail, Inc .......... 30
- Written statement .......... 86
- Letter to Senator Symms .......... 95

Morgan, Richard D., Executive Director, Federal Highway Administration .......... 41
- Written statement .......... 107
- Responses to additional questions .......... 112

Robertson, F. Dale, Chief, Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture .......... 39
- Written statement .......... 104

Rockefeller, Hon. John D. IV, U.S. Senator from the State of West Virginia .......... 10
- Written statement .......... 45

Walter, J. Jackson, President, National Trust for Historic Preservation .......... 21
- Written statement .......... 70
- Responses to additional questions .......... 77

Weygand, Hon. Robert A., Member, Rhode Island House of Representatives, representing the American Society of Landscape Architects .......... 24
- Suggested report language .......... 28
- Written statement .......... 81

## ADDITIONAL MATERIAL

American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, results of a survey on scenic byways .......... 129

Letters:
- Keibert, Kermit, Director, Idaho Transportation Department .......... 5
- Backes, Richard A., Highway Commissioner, North Dakota State Highway Department .......... 9

S. 432 .......... 172

Statements:
- DeFazio, Hon. Peter A., a Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon .......... 43
- American Recreation Coalition .......... 149
  - Responses to questions from Senator Symms .......... 155
- Highway Users Federation .......... 159
  - Responses to questions from Senator Symms .......... 162
- League of American Wheelmen .......... 167
- Travel and Tourism Government Affairs Council .......... 169

# SCENIC BYWAYS STUDY ACT OF 1989

FRIDAY, JUNE 9, 1989

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Environment and Public Works,
Subcommittee on Water Resources, Transportation,
and Infrastructure,
*Washington, DC.*

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:35 a.m., in room 406, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Daniel Patrick Moynihan (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators Moynihan, Symms, and Reid.

Also present: Senator Chafee.

## OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Senator **Moynihan**. Good morning to our guests and our distinguished witnesses. This is a hearing of the Subcommittee on Water Resources, Transportation, and Infrastructure on S. 432, a bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, Mr. Rockefeller, on which I've joined him, to direct the Secretary of Transportation to identify scenic and historic roads and to develop methods of designating, promoting, protecting, and enhancing roads as scenic and historic roads.

This is a very appropriate measure for the Senator from West Virginia to offer, first, because they have some of the most beloved of all the scenic highways at ridge top, across the Blue Ridge; but also because the roads across the mountains of West Virginia into the western part of the United States would be, after the canals, the first great public works of this country and this committee was involved with them. I am hugely pleased to be a cosponsor and I'm looking forward to hearing from the author of the legislation.

But first, our good friend and colleague, who has some scenic sights of his own, Senator Symms.

Senator, would you like to make some opening remarks?

## OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. STEVE SYMMS, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF IDAHO

Senator **Symms**. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make some opening remarks and I'll try to be as brief as possible.

Senator **Moynihan**. Take your time.

Senator **Symms**. I would be a little bit better prepared, Mr. Chairman, but the scenic highway, the Shirley Highway that I was on this morning took me an hour to get in here. It is quite unlike those highways in Idaho, I must say.

I am pleased that the subcommittee will meet this morning to consider some potential elements of the next highway bill. I think it is important that we begin as early as possible since I believe we will have a lot of work to do between now and the next highway bill that we bring forward. I particularly appreciate our distinguished colleague from West Virginia, Senator Rockefeller, sponsor and chief proponent of the scenic byways legislation, being here this morning.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to mention that I'd like to welcome Hugh Lydston, who is the Chief of Transportation Services at the Idaho Transportation Department. He will testify on behalf of Kermit Kiebert, the Director of the Transportation Department, who unfortunately had to cancel his trip to Washington in order to take care of some business back in the State.

S. 432, which we will hear comments on today, requires the Secretary of Transportation to develop recommendations for a national scenic byways program, conduct a national inventory of scenic byways, compile information on the economic impact of tourism associated with scenic byways, and conduct case studies of existing State programs. The bill authorizes $1 million to pay for the study. But as I understand it, Senator Rockefeller and other proponents of the bill intend this study to be used in the formulation of a Federal Scenic Byways program which would be part of the 1991 Highway Bill.

Scenic byways are great in concept and can be great in substance when developed through the appropriate means. According to the Census Bureau statistics cited in written testimony by the Highway Users Federation, 300,000 Americans a day leave on a vacation trip, travelling mostly on highways. The Federal Highway Administration report entitled, "Scenic Byways" indicates that approximately 17 percent of all personal vehicle miles are driven for scenic and recreational purposes. Clearly, that means that a lot of motorists are interested in this subject and are already using scenic highways. There is little doubt that they are an economic boon to most areas because of the tourist trade that develops around them.

So, the question I would pose to my colleagues would be, who could oppose scenic byways? My guess is almost nobody opposes them, with the possible exception of the most far out environmentalist organizations that want to strictly limit, if not eliminate, human access to undeveloped areas. Certainly I don't oppose scenic byways nor do the citizens of Idaho. In fact, the State of Idaho participated in two previous Federal studies to gather information on scenic highways and based on those studies, the State began designating scenic highways as far back as 1977. There are now nine scenic highways and one historic highway designated in the State covering 983 miles. The scenic highway program is working very well in my State and is an important part of our overall program to encourage economic growth.

Despite its active interest in designating, protecting, and promoting its own scenic highways, the Idaho Transportation Department is very wary of this bill, as we will hear this morning, and they have already written about their concerns with it because of its potential adverse consequences for the Idaho Highway Program. I'm very concerned, also, and want to have us carefully look at this bill.

I wanted to emphasize a couple of points here but our concerns about the Federal Scenic Highway Program will be developed more fully in the course of the legislative process. So I think there is ample time for us to work out these problems.

First, scenic highways in Idaho and other rural States are not just little used back country roads leading to some forgotten fishing hole. Our highways carry trucks and other commercial traffic, people travelling daily to and from work, as well as tourists and local recreational drivers. Our scenic highways are often the only highways in a particular area and we cannot abide further federally-imposed restrictions on the State's ability to make improvements on these roads.

I understand many of the groups supporting this bill do so in hopes that greater Federal participation will mean improvements to scenic highways. But it is difficult to believe that this is the goal of groups such as the Wilderness Society, the National Audubon Society, Friends of the Earth, and some other environmental organizations who are listed as supporters of S. 432.

Secondly, I am very curious what States like Idaho, which already designate and promote scenic highways, have to gain from the establishment of a Federal Scenic Byway Program. Given that we're going to spend a finite amount of money on the highway program—on which, in my view, we don't spend enough, but we spend what we can get through the Congress, but it is a finite amount of money—a Federal Scenic Byway Program means less Federal-Aid funds will be available for other primary, secondary, and urban roads. Presumably, participation in the Federal program would not be mandatory but once Federal-Aid Highway Funds are made available for such purposes, particularly if Congress establishes a separate funding category for scenic byways, most States will have little choice but to participate in order to take advantage of the Federal funds. The determination about the priority of scenic highway development will have been made by Congress and the States will simply have to adjust the focus of their highway programs accordingly.

Let no one forget that any scenic highway program authorized by Congress is likely to emanate from this committee. The leader and our distinguished colleague and good friend Senator Chafee is often fond of reminding this Senator and many of our witnesses, especially those from the Federal Highway Administration and the Corps of Engineers, that this is the Environment and Public Works Committee. Nobody should suffer under the illusion that this committee is going to authorize a scenic byways program without attaching some tight Federal strings to protect all that federally- recognized, federally-funded scenery, although State and local highway departments that like the current design and environmental requirements on Federal-Aid projects should absolutely love any new scenic byways program we can come up with here.

So those are a few of my concerns about a Federal Scenic Byway Program. There are many others, including the very broad land use planning implications of such a program.

I'll leave it at that for now, Mr. Chairman. And I'm pleased, as I say again, that you have provided this opportunity for the subcommittee to take this testimony on S. 432. I hope the legislation will be allowed to work its way through the normal legislative process so all of us who are interested will have an opportunity to work with Senator Rockefeller and others who have proposed this idea. I think it is entirely possible that some of my skepticism could be worked out before we reach the end of the legislative process. But I just want to make it clear that there are some concerns from some people.

At this point, I would like to ask unanimous consent to include in the hearing record a copy of the letter I received from Kermit Kiebert stating the Idaho Transportation Department's official views on S. 432.

Senator MOYNIHAN. We're happy to do that, Senator.

[The letter referred to follows:]

STATE OF IDAHO Cecil D. Andrus Governor
TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT
P.O. BOX 7129 • BOISE, ID • 83707-1129 • 208/334-8000

April 20, 1989

The Honorable Steven D. Symms
United States Senate
509 Senate Hart Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

ATT: Taylor Bowlden

Subject: S.432--Scenic Byways Study Act of 1989

Dear Senator Symms:

As requested in your letter of February 21, we have reviewed the subject legislation and offer the following comments.

This Department participated in the past two scenic highways studies (1962 and 1973) cited in subsection 2(b)(1), and the Idaho Transportation Board has designated nine state scenic highways and one historic route for a total of 983 highway miles.

All six of this Department's administrative districts have scenic routes serving areas of unusual scenic beauty. We believe that Idaho's approach to this issue has been satisfactory and that, therefore, the designation of scenic highways should remain a province of the states.

In our opinion, S.432 and its counterpart H.R.1087 would intervene in the states' scenic highway designation process and would be detrimental to the best interests of the states and counterproductive to highway improvement.

Provisions of S.432 are herewith referenced along with this Department's analysis as follows:

SECTION 2. FINDINGS, PURPOSE, AND POLICY

Subsection (a)(3) states that, "These corridors need to be identified and wisely managed..." This section connotes a negative implication that wise management has been lacking and invites the conclusion that previous national studies of scenic routes, by Executive Order 11017 in 1962 and section 134 of the 1973

CONTINUED

Highway Act, failed to identify scenic routes. The Department feels that both studies were comprehensive and guidelines for scenic evaluation were established. The Idaho Transportation Department does not agree with the implication of unwise management or lack of designation of scenic routes suggested by this subsection.

Subsection (a)(6) calls for, "A national program...to identify, designate and promote scenic byways and to protect and enhance the recreational, scenic, historic, and cultural qualities of the areas through which these byways pass." (Underscoring added.) Given that wording, we envision situations where needed highway capacity and safety improvement projects would have Federal-aid withheld due to competing concerns and perceptions of an area.

SECTION 3. SCENIC BYWAYS PLAN.

Section three requires the Secretary of Transportation to prepare "a nationwide, long-range plan for the identification, designation, promotion, protection and enhancement of scenic and historic roads." This mandate for tne impractical blanket treatment of all states would produce more red tape and inflexible decisions and standards from the federal level.

Subsection (a)(3) says that "Such guidelines and criteria shall include measures...to avoid adverse safety and environmental consequences of expanded use of these corridors." While this provision can be variously interpreted, we are concerned that a widening project for safety purposes on a designated scenic byway would be nullified due to an area protection decision.

Subsection (a)(5) lists as an element of the plan, "Forecasts of significant changes in traffic volumes, safety consequences, and environmental and economic impacts associated with scenic byway designation." The state feels that the federal reaction to these parameters would supplant state criteria and would cause unnecessary duplication of effort with respect to existing federal environmental regulations. Further, the answer to a traffic capacity problem might be to restrict travel or trucks on many highways.

The Definitions section contains only two terms: "Scenic Byway" and "Secretary." Definitions should have also included the dimensions of a "corridor" and what constitutes an "area."

CONTINUED

The reason that this Department so strongly opposes S.432 and H.R.1087 is because the bill provisions are catastrophically detrimental to application of Federal-aid for highways with national scenic designation.

Either bill has the potential for effectively converting a major portion of Idaho's highways to operational Federal control insofar as eligibility of Federal-aid is concerned. It is the Idaho Transportation Department's certain opinion that substantial sections of all of the State's major routes would be affected. Included would be U.S. Highways 2, 12, 20, 26, 30, 91, 93 and 95; and State Highways 21, 28, 33, 51, 55, 87 and 200.

The Idaho Transportation Department urges you to oppose S.432 for a Scenic Byways Study Act.

Sincerely,

Kermit V. Kiebert
KERMIT V. KIEBERT
Director

KVK:JMC:ssk/mc:susp89~398
cc: Idaho Congressional Delegation
Francis Francois, Director/AASHTO

Senator SYMMS. I thank you very much for your indulgence. It took me a little longer than I intended.

Senator MOYNIHAN. We welcome Mr. Lydston to the committee. We'll hear him shortly.

Senator SYMMS. I would also like to ask unanimous consent that a statement on the scenic byways bill on behalf of Senator Warner be inserted in the record at this point.

Senator MOYNIHAN. That will be done. A statement by our Chairman Quentin Burdick on this matter will also be included.

[The statements referred to follow:]

### OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. QUENTIN N. BURKICK, U.S. SENATCR FROM THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

I am pleased that today's hearing on scenic byways is being held by the Subcommittee on Water Resources, Transportation and Infrastructure.

The Environment and Public Works Committee has jurisdiction over the Federal-aid highway program as well as programs to protect the environment. The work of the Committee brings together concerns with highway design and construction as well as roadside landscape. The Committee is interested in the subject of scenic roads in general and in Senator Rockefeller's bill, S. 432, which directs the Secretary of Transportation to design a national system of scenic byways.

Several States have developed very good scenic byways programs on their own, and I am especially interested in hearing about their experiences. I have asked the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) to poll its members for their views on S. 432. According to AASHTO, those results should be available by July, and I would ask that the hearing record remain open until then. Also, I understand that the General Accounting Office will be undertaking a series of case studies of State scenic byways programs. The North Dakota Highway Commissioner, Mr. Richard A. Backes, has provided me with a letter containing his views on S. 432, and I would like to have it included in the hearing record.

Among the questions I hope today's discussion will address are ones on what Federal role, criteria, and regulations would be appropriate; whether a national program would focus on existing roads or new ones; how a program would achieve coordination among Federal, State, and local governments, as well as among many diverse interests; how economic development opportunities can be reconciled with protection of the environment; what a national program would cost and whether funds would be diverted from existing categories within the Federal-aid program; and what the cost and scope of a new scenic byways study would be?

I am sure today's distinguished group of witnesses will provide much thoughtful testimony what will assist the Committee as it begins its inquiry into the feasibility, and desirability, of a national scenic byways program. I look forward to hearing more about the proposal of a study of America's scenic roads.

**NORTH DAKOTA STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT**

600 East Boulevard Avenue
Bismarck, North Dakota –
58505-0700

INFORMATION: (701) 224-2500

George A. Sinner, Governor
Richard J. Backes, Commissioner
Ray Zink, Chief Engineer

FAX MAIL: (701) 224-0426

May 18, 1989

Senator Quentin Burdick
United States Senate
511 Hart Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Burdick:

Subject: S.432 Scenic Byways Study Act of 1989

We have reviewed the proposed Scenic Byways Act legislation and wish to offer the following comments:

This Department has supported the development of scenic roads for many years. ND 1804 and 1806 are identified as a part of the Lewis and Clark Trail and are an example of our commitment. We therefore wish to endorse the concept of such legislation because we believe it could focus attention on a scenic highway system. The result would hopefully provide some uniformity in the selection, signing, and mapping of such routes.

Our concern with the bill may be premature, but we hope that the study will not result in any additional protective measures which will inhibit or prevent the development of the byway road system itself. The present environmental, archaeological, fish and wildlife, historical, and beautification requirements are already more than adequate to "protect" a scenic byway.

We respectfully request that you support S.432 with the condition that the control remain in local hands and that no additional federal controls be imposed.

Sincerely,

Richard A. Backes
Highway Commissioner

90:WW:pmk

## STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN W. WARNER, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

Mr. Chairman, I may be a little biased, but I believe that my State of Virginia has some of the most scenic roads and byways to be found anywhere in the Nation. I know that these byways are a major reason that so many people come to the Commonwealth every year for vacation and leisure activities. They come to enjoy the natural beauty of the State and the many historical sites located throughout the Commonwealth.

I know how important a contribution these visitors make to the economic health of Virginia. I firmly believe that efforts should be made to identify and preserve scenic byways for present enjoyment and for future generations.

I am pleased to note that Virginia is one of the States that already has a scenic byway program by which State and local officials cooperate to identify and mark particularly scenic and historic byways. In am vitally interested in any legislation that will foster these efforts on a National and State basis.

One aspect of Virginia's program which I feel is particularly important is the deference paid to local citizens in the designation of any highway as a "scenic highway". It is important to designate and preserve scenic highways, but it is also important to remember that in many rural areas the local citizens hope to develop an economic base beyond tourism. I hope that any program that is developed under any legislation will recognize these local interests. I hope some of the witnesses will address this aspect of a scenic byway program.

I want to commend Senator Rockefeller for his interest and initiative in this subject and I wish to commend you, Mr. Chairman, for holding this hearing. During the next two years, this subcommittee will look at the future of our Federal-aid highway programs. I understand that there is a desire to move this legislation soon so that any study would be available when this work begins.

I want to welcome the witnesses here today and say that I look forward to hearing their testimony.

Senator MOYNIHAN. Now we turn to our most distinguished colleague and former Governor, as well as United States Senator, John Jay Rockefeller.

## STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER, IV, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

Senator ROCKEFELLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As always, you are very gracious and I am very pleased that you invited me to come before this Subcommittee on Water Resources, Transportation, and Infrastructure to talk about the Scenic Byways Study Act of 1989, which I proudly offer for your consideration.

I introduced this bill in February which requests that the Secretary of Transportation suggest a possible design for a national system of local and scenic byways and update the national inventory of existing scenic historic roads. A national inventory of these roads has not been done in almost two decades.

The bill also calls for a study of the economic impact of scenic byways on travel and tourism to our States. And it would also look at case studies of some of the very best scenic byway programs. There are a number of States that have superb programs—in fact, there are 30 States that have scenic byway programs—and they need to be looked at for the very best possible ideas.

Mr. Chairman, as you well know, this is not an idea that I can take credit for. This is an idea that started with Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, and was vigorously endorsed by President Reagan's Commission on Americans Outdoors. This Commission found that next to the act of walking, pleasure driving was the most predominant form of recreational activity in this country. I do not mean driving to work, I mean driving for the purpose of recreational driving. The Commission recommended, therefore, an establishment of a network of State and local scenic byways and it asked for a Federal matching fund incentive program.

Now, you may question why Congress hasn't acted on the subject before. The fact of the matter is Congress has acted on this idea. In 1973, the Congress included a provision in the Federal Aid Highway Bill asking the Department of Transportation to study the feasibility of a national scenic byways program and to inventory existing scenic byways and historic roads. They did so. Unfortunately, when the report was released, it coincided with precisely the time of the OPEC embargo when the price of gasoline skyrocketed and our entire economy was laid low.

Tourism, in fact, on a per capita basis, may have suffered the most of any of our economic activities during that particular time. While Americans did not cease to drive back and forth to work during the embargo, they did cut back dramatically on their vacation, by automobile.

In my judgement, were it not for that energy crisis of 1972, this would all be academic—that we would already have a national scenic byway program in place. So, sixteen years later, which is where we are today, the time may be ripe for a scenic byways program. This committee as of next year—and I certainly don't need to say this to you, Mr. Chairman—will start the very important process of reexamining the Federal Highway program. The Interstate Program, because of the visionary work of the members of this subcommittee and your predecessors, is now 99 percent finished. There are about 800 miles, to be completed—500 are under construction, and just 300 yet to be done. So, it is virtually done.

Senator **Moynihan**. No more legislation.

Senator **Rockefeller**. That's right. Exactly. The Interstate Highway System has been an enormous success. It may be the single most important economic development act that this Nation ever undertook. It gets people from place to place conveniently. It gets them from place to place rapidly. But for the most part, and with some outstanding exceptions, it is not necessarily a scenic experience.

So the question is where do we go next?

This subcommittee has jurisdiction over all of our Nation's infrastructure. It seems to me that we now have the opportunity to look at our highway system in the post- Interstate era.

This then brings me to the lure of the back road. This is American in its deepest sense. It has been for many generations. The Sunday drive, the trip with the family to see the fall foliage from Vermont to New York to West Virginia. I don't know if they have fall foliage in California, I suspect not, but there are many things to see—

Senator **Moynihan**. You may be sure they have it in Idaho.

Senator **Rockefeller**. They certainly do in Idaho. Right.

Senator **Moynihan**. Everything in Idaho.

Senator **Rockefeller**. In fact, one of the early scenic byway battles took place over the Big Sur road—which is Route 1. A lot of people wanted to turn it into a four lane or a six lane highway and they said, "No, keep this as a scenic byway." It stayed as such and it was one of the great triumphs. People want to go to our National parks, they love to go to our State parks. These are extraordinarily enriching traditions and they have helped us love our Nation. They have helped us keep peace in our souls and our minds, and they have allowed families to talk to each other on weekends. I think it's something we need for future generations also.

There are also, Mr. Chairman, extraordinary economic benefits in scenic byways. Travel and tourism in the United States is not only the fastest growing industry in the country, it is already a $313 billion industry, employs 5 million Americans, and only the health care industry employs more people. It is the biggest earner of foreign exchange that we have. Every dollar spent on travel and tourism has a 1-to-18 multiplier effect. To this Senator, investing in that great resource, America's scenery, should be one of the goals of the 1991 Federal Highway Bill.

However, I want to make something very clear. When I'm talking about scenic byways, I am not talking about building any new roads. I will say that again, I am not talking about building any new roads. I am not talking about creating any huge, expensive programs. We already have our scenic highways, by definition. They are out there in the country. If we were to build them, the chances are that they would not be scenic. They are there. They are part of that rich tradition. What we need, therefore, is to designate these roads, emphasize these roads, to let the average tourist know that they exist, where they are, that they are marked, that historical or cultural information about particular sites is there for people to see. So, when we talk about improvements, what we're talking about really is pull-offs. We are talking about interpretive signs that describe the culture and the history of a particular area.

A very interesting thing happened in the 1982 Knoxville World's Fair, Mr. Chairman. I was Governor of West Virginia at the time and I didn't know quite what to send down as a State exhibition to the World's Fair. So we built ourselves a coal mine. There was a company store, there were Gatling guns to refer to the mine wars, there was a mule, pick, and shovel, the way mining used to be done. In West Virginia, we tear these things down—the tipples, the company stores, the company houses—because they are part of history. But our coal mine was the single most visited exhibition at the Knoxville World's Fair—the most visited. What it told me was that what we take for granted so often about our history, not just the beauty and culture, of an area, is of great interest to other parts of the country.

In West Virginia, we have scenery everywhere. Our Interstate system is complete, but we have all of these scenic roads and we want to showcase them. We want the glorious and the beauteous nature of our State to be seen. Frankly, we need the dollars—we have the beauty, but we need the jobs. Scenic byways in West Virginia would attract thousands and thousands of people from Pittsburgh, Richmond, Baltimore, and Washington. As our Nation gets older, as more people are living in the cities and the pressures rise, people want to get out into the countryside. We have places like historic Hinton, which, I suspect, nobody knows very much about here, but it is a turn-of-the-century railroad town of unsurpassed interest. There would be no new road necessary to get to Hinton, there is already a country road which goes there. But people don't know about this fascinating town as they go by on the Interstate.

Senator **Moynihan**. As they go by on the Interstate?

Senator **Rockefeller**. Right. But they can also get off at other places and get to these scenic roads which are already there. Wheeling, West Virginia, a Victorian town, is another good example. People go through Wheeling on an Interstate, they don't get off, the ramps are already there, but it is a marvelous, interesting Victorian place to visit. People getting off the Interstate to visit Wheeling would stop, they would eat, they would shop, they would stay overnight, and all of the attendant benefits.

Mr. Chairman, I would also say that people are no longer taking long vacations in this country. There is much more of a tendency towards what we would call "weekend vacations." I don't say they are not taking long vacations, but the bias now is towards shorter ones because of time constraints and economics. And most Americans choose to do their vacation travelling by motor vehicle, recreational vehicle, and cars.

My bill requests the Secretary of Transportation to recommend a scenic byways plan—it is a study and nothing more than that—and update the 1973 inventory of scenic byways that already exist in this country. The study is intended to give this committee what it would need in the way of current information as it considers the relationship of the scenic byways programs to the 1991 Highway Bill. The Department of Transportation will have several model scenic byway programs to base their study on. The U.S. Forest Service has an exemplary system of scenic byways. Dale Roberts will be testifying shortly. As I indicated, over 30 States already have scenic byway programs of some kind.

I want to make it very, very clear, Mr. Chairman, to the distinguished Senator from Idaho and others that it is not my intent, and there is no language, and I would be against the Federal Government superseding what the States are doing with ongoing State scenic byway programs. Under S. 432, which is my bill, the Secretary is explicitly requested to work with State and local officials, as well as interested groups, to develop a scenic byways proposal. Again, it is only a $1 million bill. It is simply a study. It commits nobody to anything. Those States with excellent scenic byway programs would serve as models for other States.

I have written every single State highway department expressing my desire to work with them in the development of a program. Obviously, I would welcome the opportunity to work with any member of this committee in that process.

I will say, Mr. Chairman, that I was very pleased last night to get the Administration's statement on scenic byways. I was pleased by the statement. The Administration said that serious thought and attention to my legislation would be good. I appreciate that enormously. Most importantly, the Administration agrees with me that scenic byways and recreational travel are appropriate issues to consider in shaping and reshaping our Federal Highway Program. I would like nothing better than to work with the Administration on scenic byways.

Mr. Chairman, I have said my piece. I have the testimony from the Secretary of the Idaho Department of Transportation in which he says that he cannot support the language in this bill that would prohibit improvements and transfer scenic byway designation to the Federal level. We have no such language. That is precisely the opposite of our purpose. Again, no new roads, no preemption of what the State is doing, simply a study to work out a plan.

With that, Mr. Chairman, and with special thanks to you and Senator Jeffords for your cosponsorship of this bill, I conclude my remarks and would be honored to respond to questions.

Senator MOYNIHAN. We are most grateful to you for bringing this issue forward. Clearly, this matter will be addressed in the coming 1991 Highway Bill, as Senator Symms says.

I have one question for you. If this is going to work, it has to be selective. There would be a tendency to proliferate, to have too many scenic highways so that it would cease to have some meaning. On that wonderful weekend, you decided to look around West Virginia and see what you've never seen before, but if every time you come to a crossroad you see a sign reading "scenic byway this way," it would end up not having a great deal of authority as a guide. How do you do that? Do you have any experience of your own?

Senator ROCKEFELLER. Yes. We are now in southern West Virginia, for example, dealing with that problem directly. Most of southern West Virginia is coal and there are these historic coal towns, that I referred to. Scranton, Pennsylvania, incidentally, has done this and they are making tens and tens of thousands of dollars and attracted tens of thousands of tourists last year. We think that Scranton, Pennsylvania, pales in comparison to southern West Virginia in terms of coal. But we have to pick and choose. Not everybody gets to be scenic. Not everybody, incidentally, is scenic. Those decisions would have to be carefully made. I would assume that the States would participate very strongly in that decision. There would have to be priorities. The magic of scenic byways is in finding them out, discovering them. And, as you say, if they are going every which way, there is no magic and the discovery will have no magic.

Senator MOYNIHAN. Maybe you can give a little thought to how that selection process is kept restrictive enough so that the designation has consequence.

Senator ROCKEFELLER. I will, Mr. Chairman. And, again, I would remind this committee that the bill before us in no way undertakes to do that.

Senator MOYNIHAN. How to do. That's what we're talking about.

Senator ROCKEFELLER. Right.

Senator MOYNIHAN. Senator Symms, would you like to question?

Senator SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, just one question. I take it, Senator Rockefeller, from what you said that West Virginia does have a scenic road program already?

Senator ROCKEFELLER. We do. When I was Governor, there is a marvelous series of roads that had different numbers that go through the central part of our State, and by the simple act of changing all of those road numbers and designating them Route 55, thus making sort of a link, that aided the tourists enormously in planning a trip of that sort.

Senator **Symms**. Do you anticipate then that the passage of a Federal category of scenic byways, which would be the follow-on, I would assume, to this bill, would improve the situation in West Virginia from what you are already doing? I think that's the concern, as I read the letter from Kermit Kiebert, from Idaho, that they think that they are already doing this and they fear——

Senator **Rockefeller**. In which case, they can pay no attention. This could quite properly be designed as an optional matter. It would seem to me that most States would welcome this kind of a program. But I certainly don't see any reason why the Federal Government should force a State to do what it doesn't want to do. It would be my judgement that most States would like to do this.

Senator **Symms**. Have you had any studies on how much of a category it might take in an over-all $12 or $13 billion Highway Bill?

Senator **Rockefeller**. No. I think even words like $12 to $13 billion are scary. Again, I remind you——

Senator **Symms**. No, that's the whole Highway Program approximately. What I mean is how much of that $12 or $13 billion would be needed to—is it too premature to estimate that?

Senator **Rockefeller**. Yes, I think it is. Remember, this bill is a study. It is only to lay before this committee the information it needs as it considers the 1991 Highway Bill, to decide whether or not—as I think there should be—there should be a scenic byway program as a part of the Highway program. Remember, I'm saying no new roads—the roads are out there—no superseding of Federal over States in any single respect. Participation in the program could be made optional, as 30 States have this already.

Frankly, I go back to the fact that recreational driving is the second most favored form of recreation in this country. We're responding to peoples' desires without new roads. I'm talking about pull-offs, overlooks, turn-offs, things of that sort, and signage, which is very important.

Senator **Symms**. Then do you think it is possible that the study might come back and say that there are already 30 or 31 States doing this and the other 19 or 20 could follow suit if they so desire and we don't need to do anything?

Senator **Rockefeller**. The report no doubt will say that about 30 States have some form of scenic byway program. But along with saying that, it will provide an inventory of what we do have out there in the way of scenic byways and it will also talk about the economic impact—the travel and tourism potential—of a scenic byway system. This is not a National system that we're talking about, this is a National effort that we're talking about. If Idaho does not want to participate in it, I think Idaho would have every right not to participate.

Senator **Symms**. Thank you very much, Senator, for your testimony and for being here this morning. We enjoyed a West Virginian on this committee for longer than I can remember and there is probably an empty seat if you're interested.

Senator **Moynihan**. You might want to join us.

Can I make just a little point. I don't know about my colleagues' experience, but there is one good guide to the State of New York—and there is only one—and it was produced in the WPA, the Works Project Administration. I think you'd find it true of Nevada, I think you would find it true of West Virginia, of Idaho, of Rhode Island, the last guide books to our States were written 60 years ago under Franklin D. Roosevelt and they are treasures. But this is part of an effort to rediscover. People could get interested in the roads west, the way west, how you got there, or so I believe.

Senator Reid, would you like to make an opening statement, sir?

## OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. HARRY REID, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF NEVADA

Senator **Reid**. Mr. Chairman, I have a statement that I would ask that you allow to be made part of the record.

Senator **Moynihan**. We'll be happy to make it part of the record at the beginning of our record.

[Senator Reid's statement follows:]

### Opening Statement of Hon. Harry Reid, U.S. Senator From the State of Nevada

Thank you Mr. Chairman for holding this hearing on America's potential for scenic highways, scenic byways, and back country byways.

I am interested in this program as it relates to Scenic Byway Study Act of 1989. There is so much potential to provide a quality recreation experience for the American people. Presently there is a need to study quality byways that have road side features or corridors of natural beauty that are many times passed by without notice. I would hope that when this effort is completed we can, in fact, interest our people in taking a little more time to enjoy those great outdoor treasures that many of us miss.

I am also concerned about the costs and benefits of such a study and the scope of it. I am interested in the role of the Federal Government and the role of local and State governments. I want to know who will be involved in the program in addition to the Federal Highway Administration and the Department of Transportation.

I am aware of the President's Commission on American Outdoors. This commission recommended the creation of State and local governments developing a network of scenic byways and an incentive program of matching funds from the Federal highway trust fund.

Since 1985, other agencies picked up on this scenic way idea and I think we should be appreciative of their efforts and certainly continue having them be part of this over all effort. The Forest Service has announced a new program to designate some of the national forest routes as scenic byways. The Bureau of Land Management has announced a new program to designate some of the public land routes as back country byways.

Mr. Chairman, we are here to discuss the merits of establishing a national scenic roads program and I am happy to be involved with you in exploring the national, regional, State and local importance of scenic byways to national travel and tourism.

Senator **Reid**. Senator Rockefeller I'm sorry that I haven't had the opportunity to listen to your entire statement. We, in Nevada, in 1983, had legislation that authorized the Director of the State Department of Transportation to designate scenic routes and we have what we believe are some very unique areas to see in Nevada. I've met with people from the Bureau of Land Management and other government agencies and I think there is a lot more that can be done in conjunction with the Federal Government. I think this inventory and review, that you are suggesting, will be especially important to Nevada. So I commend and compliment you on the work that you've done in this area and appreciate your leadership.

Senator **Rockefeller**. Thank you, Senator.

Senator **Moynihan**. Thank you, Senator Reid.

Senate Chafee, would you like to make an opening statement?

Senator **Chafee**. Mr. Chairman, I don't. I just want to first thank Senator Rockefeller for his legislation. It seems extremely interesting. This excellent book, which I just opened, the first thing I saw was Blue Ridge Highway—This magnificent highway was initially proposed during the economic depression of the 1930s by the WPA, Civilian Conservation Corps—all that harkens to back to what you were talking about.

I may not be able to stay, Mr. Chairman, but I do want to note that Robert Weygand from Rhode Island is going to testify shortly before you. He is a member of the Rhode Island House of Representatives and is representing the American Society of Landscape Architects. I thought that he must have known whom he was coming before because I see in his testimony that he talks about one of your great heroes, Frederick Law Olmsted.

Senator **Moynihan**. Yes. A patron Saint.

Senator **Chafee**. So he has scored points with you automatically.

He also mentions a man who I have not heard of but undoubtedly you have—Calvert Vaux.

Senator **Moynihan**. Olmsted's partner was Vaux.

Senator **Chafee**. His partner was Vaux?

Senator **Moynihan**. Yes.

Senator **Chafee**. Well, I knew that among the pantheon of heroes in your view, few rank above Frederick Law Olmsted.

Senator **Moynihan**. And then immediately after is Vaux.

Senator **Chafee**. Vaux, he's a sub-hero?

So I think Mr. Weygand's testimony is off to a roaring start here. I know he will do an excellent job. Bob, I'm sorry if I have to leave before you testify, but I am delighted you took the trouble to join us today.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, very much. You obviously have a most receptive committee. I hope you will have recorded Senator Symms 'suggestion that there is always room for another West Virginian on this particular body.

Senator **Reid**. We want some westerners on the committee.

Senator **Moynihan**. Thank you, Senator.

We will now hear from a panel consisting of Mr. William Least Heat-Moon, representing Scenic America; and Mr. J. Jackson Walter, representing our well-known National Trust for Historic Preservation.

Mr. Heat-Moon is the author of "Blue Highways," a journey into America, which Robert Penn Warren describes as a masterpiece. That's not everyday that you read such things. Mr. Heat-Moon is from Columbia, Missouri. You are first on our list and so we welcome you, sir.

## STATEMENT OF WILLIAM LEAST HEAT-MOON, REPRESENTING SCENIC AMERICA

Mr. **Heat-Moon**. Thank you, Senator. I'm delighted to be here. I am agog that I am in Washington in these august halls and we're sitting here actually talking about back roads. I'm also agog that somebody in this city is paying attention to the landscape and to beauty and to what it may do to our hearts and minds. And that's what I would like to talk about today.

First, Congressman DeFazio, the primary sponsor of this bill in the House of Representatives, has asked that I submit for the record his statement of support for this legislation.

Senator MOYNIHAN. We're happy to receive it. We appreciate that. (See p. 43.)

Mr. HEAT-MOON. I am a writer. I'm not a public speaker. I'm used to having the time and the opportunity to correct my blunders and errors as I write. Today, however, rather than trying to read a statement, I want to try to speak it and I want to try to speak from the heart and I will take my chances with blunders and mistakes, not having the eraser key handy.

I come as a citizen from middle America. I do not come as an expert. I may have one area of expertise, which I'll mention in just a moment.

If we were to lay out a map of the United States, at least the contiguous 48 States, here before us and if any one of you would go to that map, put your finger on it, I could say with all honesty that I've been within 60 miles, at least, of the spot where your finger would fall. I've been in every congressional district in the United States, in the 48 States anyway. In the east, I've been much closer—within 25 miles of any given place. So if I have any kind of expertise, it is that I feel I know what not only backroad America is like, but what our highways, in the larger aspect, are like also.

I also feel that I know something about what people who live along these roads are saying or thinking, what they wish, especially in the context of American roads.

"Blue Highways," when it came out in 1983, began selling far in excess of what any of us expected. It sold nearly a quarter of a million copies in hardback and it sold well over a million in paperback. We estimate at least three readers for every book, so we're talking somewhere in the neighborhood of four to five million people have read that book. Many of them were willing to lay out the nearly $20 for it. That is a fact that is interesting to me. I think it indicates this about what's happening in America and that is there is a real concern among Americans of all ages—when I give a talk, I find people who are in their 80s there, I find people who are in their 20s there—there is a real concern in this country for things that are genuine, for things that are untrammeled. People want to know what it is that has made them Americans.

I think that they saw in "Blue Highways" a bit of a flickering hope that if you take to the open road—as Walt Whitman wanted us to do and recommended that we do in another century—if you look hard and you go slowly enough, you can find real America still there. You can find an America that is not yet trammelled by billboards, by excessive commercialism. I think that's the note that "Blue Highway" struck and I think that's the reason, among other reasons, for its success.

I think also that people in this country understand, sometimes perhaps it's a bit subconscious, but it's there, that all of us—black, red, white, yellow—all of us came from the other side of the world. We all are descendants of people who have come from the eastern hemisphere. And, perhaps with the exception of blacks who came here without their consent, most all of us are descendants of people who came to this hemisphere looking for a better way of life. So there is in our blood I think—and I do happen to believe in something called genetic memory—there is in our blood a belief that when things go bad, you correct that by taking to the road, you move where you are. So often in this country we can do that only once or twice a year—we take the family vacation.

But that vacation to Americans, I think, has always been a time of healing. But it is very, very difficult to get healed if what you're seeing is exactly like the place that you came from. When people want to be healed by the highway, they want to see something new and something different.

What I submit to you is that our passage over the land to an American is as rain is to the Irishman, as sand is to the Bedouin. What I mean is that highway travel, road travel, to an American is something that makes us what we are. I think seeing America, seeing a real and genuine America, one that has not been commercialized to look like every other part of the country, has a very direct link with understanding who and what we are. I think if our passage across this land is through a blighted land, if our passage is corrupted by ugliness, if the evident history that is in every State has been eradicated, then we lose something very essential that makes us what we are.

I submit that the commercial degradation of our landscape is a real and immediate and pernicious threat. It is a threat not only to our economy, it is a threat to our hearts and to our minds.

We've talked this morning about the scenic byways as something that would be good for the economy. That's important and that's fine. But I think it's also something very important for our hearts, for our souls.

When I've been travelling in backroads America in places like Nameless, Tennessee and Humptulips, Washington, Scratch Ankle, Alabama and Knawbone, Indiana, I've found one thing as common as any other thing—that is that the people in outback America believe that their government has forgotten them. They believe that they have been consigned to live in a highway strip America, while the people in Washington live in a city that takes great pains to keep itself beautiful. They feel a kind of betrayal on the part of their representatives. The response is even sadder because the response is not to fight back. They feel there is nothing that they can do. They feel helpless. In some ways I think they must feel like the Chinese students—what can we do? But they have not yet developed the courage to make a stand. What they do then is to anesthetize themselves to their surroundings. They go numb and they no longer see the place where they live. They come to believe then that when their two weeks for a little vacation come, to find beauty, to find the land again, they must go someplace else. I think that's a very sad comment. We live in a land where to find what we really want, we cannot do it at home, we have to go to another place.

The irony is that Kansans go to Missouri, Missourians go to Kansas, or Oregonians go to California, Californians go to Oregon, New Yorkers go to Florida—we're all looking in somebody else's backyard for what we should have on our own. That's why if this study goes through, I hope that it is going to be large enough to encompass all of America. I hope nobody is going to be left out of this.

Americans take to the road and they start looking for those little green signs that say "scenic view." I submit to you that if scenic views are so rare in the United States that we have to put up a sign calling attention to them, something is seriously wrong. We all should have scenic views very, very close to us, if not within our own backyards.

I would like also to suggest that the purpose of this Highway Act is to promote tourism. I think also that we need to remember that there is something that happens with the young that I think has not been happening to a degree that we'd like to see and that is we expect the young to feel a patriotism towards the Nation, to love this Nation, but yet more and more we show them a Nation that looks like any other part of the Nation. We show them a Nation abused by billboards, by look alike plastic architecture, then we turn around and expect them to love this land. How is it that can be? It seems to me that the seeds of patriotism, of a real mature and genuine patriotism, lie in the young coming to see the facts of their land, the facts of their landscape, or they come to know the smells, the sights, so they can feel the land of America. I think that when the young begin to see the actual things that comprise the Nation, from that their patriotism can proceed.

To conclude, let me say that I don't think that this bill really is asking very much. It is asking only for a study. Surely nobody can be opposed to that. But I think what it promises is something so very much greater, something so very much larger, and that is I think it promises to help us become more and more of a people who can cherish the land, the landscape, and I think that in that cherishing that we have a chance of seeing a paradigm of the values that I assume and trust are expressed in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. In other words, if we realize that the notion of the men and women who have made this country, if the goal was to make a community of diverse individuals that in some way were bound together, they are going to see that in the land itself because nature, if it shows us any other thing, it shows us a diversity within union.

Today, when I get in my car or in my truck "Ghost Dancing"—which I took travelling around the country in 1978 on the "Blue Highway" trip—when I get in one of those vehicles, I so often feel that the diversity is fast leaving us. With that, I think, goes a sadness. I would like to say that I hope that all of you Senators will help us keep this natural and cultural splendor that I assume is our birthright. I hope so very much that you will not deprive us of that—that you will help us preserve it.

Thank you.

Senator Moynihan. Thank you, Mr. Heat-Moon. We welcome your testimony but you've caused some problem with a member of this committee who's completely absorbed in reading your book and seems not to have paid the least attention to your testimony, which is a testimony to your book, in any event.

Mr. Heat-Moon. Just reading about where I went to school.

Senator Moynihan. Mr. Walter, we welcome you, sir, on behalf of the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

## STATEMENT OF J. JACKSON WALTER, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION

Mr. **Walter**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For the record, I am Jack Walter, the President of the National Trust for Historic Preservation. I have a written statement.

Senator **Moynihan**. We will put in the record.

Mr. **Walter**. Thank you very much.

I am very pleased to be here to reiterate the support of the National Trust for S. 432, the Scenic Byways Study Act of 1989. I certainly commend the deliberate approach that asks for a plan that will contain an up-to-date compilation and inventory of all of the work on scenic byways, their economic impact, and educational and recreational potential.

I am particularly pleased to see the policy declaration in section 2(c) of the bill, in part because it so closely parallels the statement of purpose adopted by the Congress 40 years ago this year in its charter for the National Trust, which is charged with the responsibility to encourage public participation in the preservation of sites, objects, and buildings significant in American history and culture.

Mr. Chairman, you commented on guide books and I would be remiss if I didn't put in a small plug for a trustee of the National Trust, Roger Kennedy, whose new "Smithsonian Guides to American History" are just out and are a wonderful update of the old 1930s guides.

Senator **Moynihan**. You are absolutely right. Those guide books, along with his book, "American Churches," is a national treasure.

Mr. **Walter**. Roger will be pleased with that exchange, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

While the National Trust certainly makes no claim to be involved in the Highway design or traffic safety business, we surely are involved in the other principal activities foreseen in S. 432--economic development through tourism and the interpretation and protection of historic and cultural resources. I would like to give you a couple of examples.

The first example is a visit that I made last weekend to the Villages—there are four of them—the Villages of Van Buren County in what we can think of as deepest southeast Iowa. I spent the night there in the Manning Hotel, built in the 1850s in the village of Keosauqua, once a stop on the underground railroad. I left behind the Village's sesquicentennial celebrations to drive east on county road J40 through Bentonsport, named for Missouri's Senator Thomas Hart Benton, whose ferry once operated across there. The Mason House in Bentonsport, now a handsome brick bed and breakfast, was the stopping place for the Des Moines River Steamboat captains and, after the steamboat business went out, for the railroad men. Then I drove on to Bonaparte, supposedly the only town in the world named Bonaparte, or so Bonapartians would have me believe, there to join in festivities associated with the listing of the entire river front main street of the Village of Bonaparte on the National Register of Historical Places. Here is a small town revitalization success story that uses the principles of the National Trust's Main Street Program and now, if Senator Chafee can help us a little bit, is poised to use the rehab tax credits, assuming that we can lower the barriers erected by the 1986 passive activities rules. Anchoring Bonaparte, perhaps predictably, is a restaurant called The Retreat, a fine restaurant in a restored grist mill. It draws customers from a radius of comfortably more than 100 miles.

The key to the economic success of the Villages of Van Buren has to be the pocketbooks of out of town tourists. So the restaurant and the extensive promotion of the J40 byway loop are central to all four Villages of Van Buren. The whole idea is to drive or to bicycle the entire loop.

The interpretation of individual buildings in Bentonsport was splendid, but there was no good focus at all on the other villages nor on the loop itself. Perhaps there's much that we could learn from the National Park Service at Cade's Cove, which is a scenic road within the Great Smokey Mountain National Park in Tennessee. There is an interpretation effort aimed directly at drivers and passengers of that area's historic agricultural and religious history. It is a very fine model for the S. 432 study.

A second example would be perhaps the Ashley River Road in Charleston, SC. If, on the one hand, there are no particular growth pressures on the historic and cultural resources of the villages of Van Buren in southeast Iowa, there certainly are growth pressures on the Ashley River Road. We're talking about the west side of the Ashley River just adjacent to Charleston. This is the access road to such major tourist destinations as the National Trust's own Drayton Hall, and a magnolia plantation, Middleton Place.

Historically, of course, access to these houses was from the Ashley River so all of the properties are oriented toward the river. Today, access is via the Ashley River Road. This is a canopy road with live oaks arching across to form a tunnel lined with spanish moss. Interestingly, again, there is no interpretation anywhere of the Ashley River Road corridor—how it came to be that way and, collectively, what those houses are about. The traffic generated by subdivision developments is cited by highway officials as the reason to widen the road. This would, of course, destroy the canopy because the trees would have to be cut down. Here we are engaged in a private protection effort. The National Trust is gathering easements from all of the abutting landowners, including the South Carolina Parks Department. That canopy road is a State treasure. Tourists take home photographic and mental images of the Ashley River Road and that canopy as they think about their trip up to, for example, the wonderful closing events of Charleston's annual festival that takes place at Middleton Place. If the trees and the canopy disappear, the entire corridor would lose its magic.

After last year's Manassas tussle, if there is one thing that we've all learned, it is that government acquisition can be at best a last gasp solution. We know that private remedies, as for example, along the Ashley River Road, simply often aren't in the cards. So, taking a look at the protection of the resources that line scenic byways, systems of doing that, and land use controls which, after all, are local not Federal, all have to be part of that. So, too, the National Trust has proposed the National Heritage Conservation Act aimed at the Nation's natural and historic landmarks. This is legislation that we hope will be starting out soon and we would like to work with your staff in looking at that.

So we have themes—economic development through tourism, plus interpretation, plus protection of fragile resources. These are central themes in the work of the National Trust and in the thoughtful and deliberate approach to scenic byways being advanced by S. 432. We commend Senator Rockefeller and you, Mr. Chairman, for your sponsorship of this bill and urge its prompt adoption.

Thank you for the privilege of being with you this morning.

Senator MOYNIHAN. We thank you, sir. Obviously, from time to time, your job has become a nice one when you get to go to these places.

Mr. WALTER. Occasionally, it does resemble a job, also, Senator.

Senator MOYNIHAN. Gentlemen, any questions for our panelists?

Senator SYMMS. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

Senator REID. I have no questions, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MOYNIHAN. We want to thank you very much. I don't know if we'll ever get Senator Reid out of that book, but there's nothing wrong with reading.

Senator CHAFEE. Mr. Chairman, could I ask of the panel just three brief questions?

Senator MOYNIHAN. Sure.

Senator CHAFEE. First, if you're going to have scenic highways, it seems to me that they've got to be kept scenic and, therefore, you can't have billboards on them. Is that right or wrong, yes or no?

Mr. WALTER. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. HEAT-MOON. I agree with that, unless we're talking about informational billboards such as Vermont has.

Senator CHAFEE. Second, it seems to me that if we're going to be successful in these scenic highways, there would have to be cutouts so people can see something on occasion. For example, in Acadia National Park up in Maine, the sides of the road are so overgrown that in many places people can no longer see the ocean or Frenchmen's Bay. I think it can't be just totally wild, there has to be some manicuring, if you will.

Senator MOYNIHAN. Could I interrupt my friend to make a reference to Olmsted, who he earlier called up? These issues arose in Central Park about 30 years after he designed it and he produced a little pamphlet which he simply entitled "On The Use Of The Axe."

Senator CHAFEE. Finally, it seems to me that if we're going to do all this, there has to be some changes in the Federal Highway regulations because frequently States are put in the position, as we have been in my own State—we've got a beautiful scenic road, it's in terrible shape, they'd like to fix it, not widen it but just fix it so a car could use it, but that's against Federal regulations. Under Federal regulation it has to be widened, there has to be a side shoulder on it, and if you do all that, then you wreck the scenic highway. So I presume that we've got to get into some changes in the Federal Highway regulations. Is that right or wrong?

Senator MOYNIHAN. That's a nice point. I think perhaps our panel might not know, but we're going to hear from the Federal Highway people.

Senator CHAFEE. Unfortunately, I may not be here.

Senator **Moynihan**. Your point is that the Federal Highway Administration won't let funds be used for such roads unless they are "improved." In the process of being improved, you lose what you want to keep.

Senator **Chafee**. That's right. You have to meet that mythical thing called regulations that are composed by some fellow named "They." The Federal Highway regulations must be adhered to.

Senator **Moynihan**. Let's get into that. We will ask specifically for that information.

Senator **Chafee**. If you could ask that question for me because after the next panel, I have to go. Thank you.

Senator **Moynihan**. Gentlemen, thank you very much.

I have to say that I have to be in New York at the United Nations in the context of some Chinese events, so Senator Symms has very cordially agreed to take over when we have to go, which will be soon.

But now we have a panel of persons very much involved in these matters: Ms. Teresa Mitchell, Executive Director of the Seaway Trail, Incorporated, which is a scenic route which goes across New York State; Mr. Hugh Lydston, whom we've welcomed earlier; Mr. Robert Weygand, a Member of the Rhode Island House of Representatives, representing the American Society of Landscape Architects, and Mr. Weygand, we welcome you as a fellow legislator; and Mr. John Archer, the Managing Director of Government Affairs for the American Automobile Association. We welcome you all.

Mr. Weygand, as a Representative, we'd like to ask you to speak first.

## STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT A. WEYGAND, MEMBER, RHODE ISLAND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, REPRESENTING THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS

Mr. **Weygand**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before I begin my comments, I want to thank you for your fondness for Mr. Olmsted and I want to thank Senator Chafee for his comments as well.

I've prepared a statement that I have submitted to the clerk. I, also, Mr. Chairman, have submitted just this morning some guidelines that we in Rhode Island have been using, draft guidelines thus far, for our Rhode Island Scenic Highway Board, which may be helpful particularly to the committee and Senator Symms because I think it addresses some of the very things that Senator Symms had mentioned earlier as being of concern to him.

Senator **Moynihan**. We will be happy to receive that.

Mr. **Weygand**. My name is Robert Weygand. I am a member of the American Society of Landscape Architects. I am a landscape architect practicing in Rhode Island. I have been a Member of the Rhode Island House of Representatives since 1984. I have been involved, as many of you have been, in many civic organizations, including chairing my own Town Planning Board for six years, and also being a member of the Rhode Island Scenic Highway Board.

I come before you today to talk for the American Society of Landscape Architects and also to bring you a Rhode Island example of what has happened with regard to scenic highways in our small State.

The American Society of Landscape Architects represents 10,000 landscape architects engaged in public, private, and academic practice. Our members play a major role in the design, planning, and management of the land, and they share a commitment to achieving the appropriate balance between preservation and the wise use of our nation's natural, cultural, and historic resources.

Landscape architects, starting with your friend, Mr. Chairman, Frederick Law Olmsted, have long seen transportation corridors as important resources and opportunities for recreation.

Olmsted and Vaux originally designed Central Park and also the original parkway, or scenic road concept, when they designed Ocean Parkway in the 1870s. It ran through Brooklyn from Prospect Park to Coney Island. Other urban and suburban parkways were developed over the next decades. In Rhode Island, I'm sure Senator Chafee knows Ocean Drive in Newport. If you've had the opportunity to be there, you know it offers great vistas of Narragansett Bay and the Atlantic Ocean, designed also by Mr. Olmsted. A number of other small and rural roads have offered a great deal of parkway recreational experience, such as Blackstone Boulevard, Veterans Parkway in East Providence, and a number of others.

After the creation of some of the great parkways, scenic roads were given surprisingly little attention in the years thereafter. Now, however, some States, including the State of Rhode Island, the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management are extending Olmsted's formula for recreation along transportation corridors to additional roads. The bill you have before you, S. 432, could be the first step toward creating an entire system of such roads across the nation.

It is highly appropriate, therefore, to study what a system of scenic byways could be before we get too far down the road, for there are a great number of issues that need to be evaluated before we can move forward.

While limited development along a byway may be appropriate for interpretation, visitation, or even tourism purposes, some types of development should be considered inappropriate, such as billboards of certain size, character, and type. Inappropriate signage and development that interferes with the scenic character of the corridor is certainly of concern to us as landscape architects.

ASLA is equally concerned about construction standards and would urge that the subcommittee, through report language, offer the Department of Transportation some guidance on this. The example I would give you about Rhode Island, Mr. Chairman, it talks directly about the design standards that we have tried to implement in Rhode Island to help improve scenic byways.

Second, ASLA is concerned that the definition of scenic byways may not be broad enough in the legislation to include many corridors with scenic values but with country roads that do not meet Federal highway standards.

A fundamental of the byway system should be that it is not a high-speed transportation corridor, and it therefore should not have to meet certain construction standards required for other parts of the Federal Highway System. Often these standards actually detract from the scenic qualities of a road. To ensure that roads do not have to meet higher design speed standards than necessary, we recommend that a system of speed limits be considered for the system and perhaps matched to different classes of roadways.

A statement from the Senate report accompanying the Federal-Aid Highway Improvement Act of 1982 I think is most appropriate It says:

> Roads through areas administered by the Federal land managing agencies must be carefully designed to protect important natural and cultural resources under the jurisdiction of these agencies. Such roads must be designed to blend in with the natural landscape. Because of the resources preserved in the Federal land management areas, and the type of tourist uses in such areas, the roads in certain instances do not have to be constructed to normal highway standards.

We therefore suggest, Mr. Chairman, that in determining such standards, a stronger role for the Director of the National Park Service and the Chief of the U.S. Forest Service be established.

Let me take but just a moment, Mr. Chairman, to tell you about the Rhode Island example. We had in a small southwestern portion of our State a road that was considered for the 3R project. As Senator Chafee said, it was a road improvement project. Many of the local politicians in the area and the town that was involved wanted to have the roadway "improved" for just regular highway travel, as it had always been. It is an unique area. It goes through many unique geological features such as kettle holes, outwashes, and the terminal moraine of the glaciers. Many people who live in the area do not know that, they just know that it was a hilly, winding, wonderful road with rhododendron and oak trees and it was just a delightful place to be. Developers, farmers, and residents of the area always liked it like that. In fact, developers made sure that there was a good deal of buffer between their developments. Schools that were situated along the street were sensitively placed.

In 1987, the Department of Transportation undertook a 3R project in the area and they came forth with a 10 percent design plan and they brought it before many of the people in the town. In doing so, I think as Senator Chafee had pointed out before, they widened the travel lanes from 10 feet to 12 feet, they widened the shoulders from 2 feet to 6 feet of asphalt pavement, they flattened both the horizontal and vertical alignment so that now the road became very flat and had not as much attractiveness and scenic beauty as it once had. It wiped out many of the stands of native Rhododendron and Oak trees that many people in the area had long enjoyed. While everybody was in favor of the improvements, the Department of Transportation was besieged by people complaining about the way they were improving it.

What eventually happened and is underway now is that the Department of Transportation, without any additional cost to the project itself, reviewed its design standards and lessened them or went to a minimum design standard, compared to what was originally considered. They reduced the lane width from 12 feet to 11 feet, they took away the 6 feet of asphalt paving on the shoulder and made it 4 feet of grass, and they preserved all the stands of Rhododendron and Oak, and they allowed for many of the trees and many of the accesses to remain as they previously were. It was a good roadway improvement project. It is called Ministerial Road in south Kingston, RI. The project is presently underway.

Many of the people in the area weren't, as we often call many of the environmentalists in Rhode Island, "tree huggers." They were just the average person and they were very concerned about the scenic beauty of this little simple country road. Through the cooperation of the Department of Transportation, without really changing anything within their system, without changing or adding any cost to the roadway improvements, they were able to sensitively address all the concerns of the people of that area. The Director of the Department of Transportation prepared a little statement for me and I would like to add this to my testimony. This is regarding this particular project. It simply says:

> The Department's policy is to apply common sense and judicious use of the ASHTO minimum standards in the development of new roadway systems.

I think that's critical in looking at Senator Symms' concerns in terms of what additional things are necessary to incorporate a scenic byway system. I think there is not really too much other than identification and education and review of design standards. There really doesn't have to be a lot to accomplish that.

In passing S. 432, you will be doing a number of things. First, you will be identifying some of the critical natural and scenic resources of our country. That is a good deal of the problem that we have out there right now. People do not understand, particularly within the Departments of Transportation, the scenic and natural beauty that exists out there. They are mostly concerned about, through no fault of their own, the public safety aspects of the roadway—so they are upgrading, widening, and flattening out roadways. What we should be doing is identifying and educating our officials and our engineers and our people as to what are scenic byways, what are good natural and scenic resources, and why they should be preserved.

Second, we should be more sensitive in our design standards. The last resort, and certainly something that I'm not really in favor of, would be prohibitions or restrictions, the imposition of land use policies by either the State or the Federal Government on adjacent land. What we should be looking at is doing the former two—identification and education and design standards.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you. I know I've run a little bit over time. I think that many of the things that we have done in our very small State of Rhode Island perhaps do not apply to Idaho, West Virginia, or many of the other States, but I think they are typical of what scenic highway boards are doing throughout the country and I think it is the kind of thing that the Federal Government could also do in a very simple way without any great deal of expense. I think S. 432 will surely do that. I applaud the committee, and you, Mr. Chairman, and Senator Rockefeller for putting forth this legislation. I urge its passage.

Thank you.

Senator Moynihan. Thank you, sir. I would hope that the ASLA would consider providing us some report language of the kind you describe so we have a sense of what it is you have in mind.

Mr. Weygand. We'd be happy to do so, Senator.

[The information requested follows:]

ASLA

**AMERICAN**
**SOCIETY OF**
**LANDSCAPE**
**ARCHITECTS**
4401 CONNECTICUT
AVENUE N W
FIFTH FLOOR
WASHINGTON, D C
20008-2302
202 686-ASLA
FAX 202 686-1001

July 14, 1989

The Honorable Daniel P. Moynihan
Chairman, Subcommittee on Water
  Resources, Transportation and
  Infrastructure
458 SDOB
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Mr. Chairman:

One June 9, 1989, the Subcommittee on Water Resources Transportation and Infrastructure held a hearing on S. 432, The Scenic Byways Act of 1989.

The American Society of Landscape Architects testified at the hearing and urged the Committee to include in its report language about construction standards.

In response to your invitation that ASLA provide some report language covering ASLA's concerns, we have enclosed a short statement. We certainly would appreciate it if the Subcommittee would consider including this language in the report accompanying S. 432.

Sincerely,

Betsy Cuthbertson
Director, Government Affairs

enc.

cc: Raymond Freeman, FASLA
    Robert Weygand, ASLA

Standards. With regard to regulation of new construction, rehabilitation, or upgrading of any route within a national scenic byways system, the Department of Transportation shall establish standards -- separate from existing Federal-Aid-Highway standards -- which adequately address the protection of the scenic and cultural resources of and along the roads.

With regard to the selection and inclusion of roads within a national scenic byway system, the Department of Transportation is encouraged to set standards broad enough to allow a wide range of road types -- from dirt roads to primary roads -- to be included.

To allow for this wide range of road types, the Department is encouraged to use varying speed limits, rather than state-of-the-art construction standards, to assure safety in the scenic byway system.

Senator MOYNIHAN. Senator Chafee?

Senator CHAFEE. No questions. That was very good testimony. Thank you.

Senator MOYNIHAN. Senator Symms?

Senator SYMMS. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MOYNIHAN. Thank you, Mr. Weygand.

Ms. Mitchell, we look forward to your testimony representing the New York State Seaway Trail, which is the great enterprise going now.

What have we here? We're collecting things. What is this? A scrapbook. The light house is along the Seaway Trail, here shows Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River, this is the scrapbook. Let me record them and give them to the archives of the committee, otherwise we'll have another investigation around here.

Welcome, Ms. Mitchell.

## STATEMENT OF TERESA MITCHELL, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, SEAWAY TRAIL, INC., OSWEGO, NY

Ms. MITCHELL. Thank you very much. Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I am Teresa Mitchell, Executive Director of New York State's Seaway Trail, Inc. The Seaway Trail was incorporated in 1978 as a private not for profit company. In 1986, New York State legislators recognized its economic potential and funded the pilot project. In 1986, the Seaway Trail became the longest national recreational trail, designated for mixed use right-of-way, offering multiple recreational opportunities. The Seaway Trail is a series of highway routes, but offers boating and bicycling access in many areas.

The Trail has drawn together technical assistance and has generated dialog for a number of agencies, businesses, and communities who share a common interest with the Trail's future economic development, scenic resource protection and historic preservation.

It is important that Interstate and State highway systems access the Seaway Trail. The Trail is paralleled and intersected along its entire route by major highway systems, including the New York State Thruway and Interstate Route 81. This enables easy access for short byway tours as well as lengthier trips. Hence, Trail benefits are not limited to the corridor but are extended for side trips, for loops, and spurs.

Seaway Trail and scenic byways create tourist dispersion, retention, and measurement opportunities. Scenic byways connect major tourist destinations with smaller cluster communities providing economic potential to all.

Seaway Trail, Inc., by resolution, supports the Scenic Byways Study Act of 1989 as enacted by the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives. Scenic Byways offer great economic potential that can create a climate which would stimulate cooperative investments between the public and private sectors. It is the hope that the Seaway Trail can serve as a case study for the Secretary of Transportation. We feel that the future organizational criteria for scenic byways nationwide should include planning and development; operations and interpretation; awareness and merchandising; and finally, a funding plan and a monitoring system.

Scenic byways will provide much needed economic growth. Tourism along the Seaway Trail in New York State has grown tremendously. Tourism-related employment reached an average of 94,843 monthly in 1986, an increase of 36 percent since 1976.

Through the framework for development of the Seaway Trail, we have established goals and objectives, determined themes, and recognized specific opportunities as well as constraints for development. Subsequently, a Seaway Trail Tourism Development Plan was prepared. A Seaway Trail Tourism Resource Inventory was completed for the 10-county area of New York State, followed by a comprehensive action plan. You have a copy of that Seaway Trail Action Plan. Presently, three separate Tourism Development Zone plans are underway. The Trail has been divided into 10 tourism zones—the criteria for that delineation includes physiographics, demographics, resources, themes, image, and product.

In New York State, loans for tourism and retail industry are not readily available. Our tourism development recommendations outline facility requirements to become tourist clusters and destinations. Our hope is that we can duplicate the financing opportunities currently available in the Province of Ontario where capable, creditable entrepreneurs can obtain mortgage guarantees for initial development as well as for improvements to their property providing that they comply with the requisites of the master plan prepared and approved for the community.

The condition of the highway corridor and its improvement, including its appearance, are important. In 1978, the New York State Department of Transportation began signing the Seaway Trail with green and white trail blazer signs. Since then a second series of War of 1812 interpretive signs are now in place. They are brown and white, featuring a ship illustration. Each of these 42 signs give a brief site-specific message about the War of 1812 along the Seaway Trail. We call this attractive the Seaway Trail's "Museum Without Walls".

In 1986, Seaway Trail created two models for outdoor, unmanned interpretive information centers for the highway corridor. To date, 31 units are completed while another 24 are scheduled for completion this summer.

The interpretative sign program will extend to waterway sites and an awareness sign program. These interpretive units will develop a sense of place for each community, enabling the traveler to experience the unique cultural and historic qualities of each of the communities.

To assist in the interpretation of the Trail's themes, four guidebooks have been researched and prepared on the following subjects [Those are the ones that I gave you, Mr. Chairman)—the War of 1812, rocks and landscapes, architecture and history, and bicycling. A Seaway "Trailscapes" publication is underway which will encourage residential, business, and community awareness, improvement, and pride. It will discuss and illustrate eight major urban and rural landscapes along the Trail, while offering examples of appropriate plant materials and landscape designs for use in each area. This free publication will encourage Trail-wide greenway enhancement by both private and public sectors.

The international loop is another unique networking option for our location. The Seaway Trail is connected at eight international bridges that connect New York State with the Province of Ontario.

Unique opportunities await boating visitors. In our specific case, Seaway Trail shoreline and the New York State Barge Canal System intersect at the Oswego Canal on Lake Ontario, and to the west in the Tonawandas connecting the Niagara River.

The visibility and awareness of the Seaway Trail is crucial toward the creation of customer demand. Through the combined efforts of county-designated tourism promotion agents and the New York State Department of Economic Development, substantial advertising has been placed. In 1989, Seaway Trail placed a buy in "Better Homes and Gardens" reaching 2.4 million readers in the northeast. In 1987, Seaway Trail was the I Love New York Summer Festival site. This Festival designation helped put the Seaway Trail on the map.

The consumer must receive a fulfillment piece which allows the reader to understand what a scenic byway is, or specifically in our case, what the Seaway Trail is.

In 1989, Seaway Trail produced an official magazine and directory called "Journey." The feature story is a tribute to the nation's 1989 lighthouse bicentennial with historical narratives on the 18 lighthouses that line the Seaway Trail area of New York State. The major goal of the publication is to create a positive image for the Trail while providing expected tourist information as well as high interest stories intended to encourage lengthier stays in the Trail area.

One of the most essential elements of a scenic byway program is the inclusion of a monitoring system. The ability to measure consumer awareness, opinion, vacation planning, and spending trends, and to evaluate advertising campaigns is crucial. Seaway Trail plans to prepare a tourism monitoring system designed to provide pertinent information about tourists, markets, competitors, tourism products and services.

The Seaway Trail is proud of its past achievements and forecasts an even more significant growth as a result of the Scenic Byway Act.

Senator MOYNIHAN. May I say that having taken that Trail, you have every reason to be proud. We appreciate very much this specific report. May I make one suggestion, however; can we stop calling it the New York State Barge Canal — it is the Erie Canal, all right? Where you are it is the Oswego Canal coming up from the Erie. We get that agreed on and we're in perfect harmony.

I have to go to the United Nations for purposes involved with events in China. My very dear friend and colleague, Senator Symms is going to take over. I regret that I can't hear the rest of the testimony. I shall have read it before it's over and appreciate all that all you have done.

Senator SYMMS. Have a safe trip.

Senator MOYNIHAN. Thank you.

Senator SYMMS. Please go ahead, Ms. Mitchell.

Ms. MITCHELL. I'm finished unless there are any questions.

Senator SYMMS. Then we will next hear from Mr. Hugh Lydston of the Idaho Department of Transportation. Hugh, welcome to the committee. It is always nice to have you back here. I've appreciated the relationship with the Idaho Department over these many years.

## STATEMENT OF HUGH LYDSTON, CHIEF OF TRANSPORTATION SERVICES, IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Mr. LYDSTON. Thank you, Senator. I appreciate the opportunity to testify and I convey the sincere regrets of our Director, Kermit Kiebert, who was unable to attend at the last minute so I am standing in for him. But he wanted me to express his sincere apologies for not making it and does appreciate the invitation to testify.

I will read most, if not all, of our written testimony and, therefore, will try to keep it short for purposes of time.

I will begin by saying that Idaho has identified and designated scenic highways and is managing those highways to protect their scenic value and, thereby, enhance their economic value and our tourism industry, as well as for the benefit of the tourist. Scenic highways are very important in our State—important to commerce as well as to recreational motorists. We would like to make the point that in our case many scenic highways also serve as important arterials for commercial traffic such as logging, movement of sawmill products, agricultural transportation, and movement of products associated with natural resources. Any Federal program designed to protect scenic highway values by prohibiting improvements needed to accommodate commercial traffic could have serious adverse consequences for Idaho and other similar rural States where in many cases alternate routes for commercial traffic simply do not exist.

I would like to speak, Mr. Chairman, to certain specific sections and subsections in the bill and specific language. Subsection 2(b)(l) of the bill refers to those studies conducted pursuant to section 134 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973 and Executive Order 11017 in 1962. As a result of those studies, the Idaho Transportation Department identified 2200 miles of potential scenic routes out of the State's system of about 5,000 miles. Those guidelines have resulted today in a designation of about 983 miles and more miles are being considered.

We believe that Idaho's approach to the issue of scenic highways has been responsive and that the designation of scenic highways should remain a discretionary authority of the States.

I understand that our testimony is the only one opposing S. 432, but I would like to make it amply clear that Idaho Transportation Department does not object to this bill without having considered it very carefully. Idaho supports the principles of improving scenic highways but cannot support the language in part of this bill that would prohibit improvements and transfer scenic byway designation to the Federal level.

We understand this bill is a study bill. We've also been told by many supporters and given to understand by other important persons involved with the development of the bill that the intention is to lift part of this language and put it in the 1991 Federal-Aid Highway Act. We, from long experience, know that when bills such as study bills or exploration bills enjoy wide support, that when it comes time to lift that language, it is often lifted in toto. In other words, it is thought that since it was well supported before, let's just use it all again. There is not a lot of thought given then to how it changes from what used to be a study bill to now a control and operation bill. For that reason, we're extremely concerned and we hope that the language in the study bill then would not be addressing areas of control.

If provisions of the bill were adopted into the next act, we are concerned and Idaho has serious reservations and objections to some of the language in this bill as follows:

Section 2. Findings, Purpose, and Policy. Subsection 2(a)(3) states that, "These corridors need to be identified and wisely managed." We believe that this connotes a negative implication that wise management has been lacking and invites the conclusion that previous national studies failed to identify scenic routes. The Idaho Transportation Department feels that those studies were comprehensive and there was information that provided guidelines for scenic evaluation that we use today. The Department does not agree with the implication of unwise management or lack of designation of scenic routes suggested by this subsection.

Subsection 2(a)(6) calls for, "A national program to identify, designate, and promote . . ."—words that we agree with—and then "to protect and enhance the recreational, scenic historic, and cultural qualities of the areas . . ."—to "protect areas"—"through which these byways pass." We're concerned with what "protection of areas" means. We're concerned with the interpretation of those words. What is the definition of an "area"? Is this an area of 20 feet from the edge of the highway, 20 miles from the highway, or 200 miles? Are we talking about corridors or vast areas? We don't know what the word "area" means. But given that wording, we envision situations where needed highway capacity and safety improvements would have Federal aid withheld due to competing concerns and perceptions about "area" protection.

Section 3. Scenic Byways Plans. This section requires the Secretary of Transportation to prepare "a nation-wide, long-range plan for the identification, designation, promotion, protection, and enhancement of scenic and historic roads." We're concerned about the protection of scenic highway and historic roads. This mandate for the impractical treatment, in our view, for all States would produce more red tape and inflexible decisions and standards from the Federal level.

Subsection 3(a)(3) says that "Such guidelines and criteria shall include measures to avoid adverse safety and environmental consequences of expanded use of these corridors." While this provision can be variously interpreted, we are concerned that a roadway widening project for safety purposes on a designated scenic highway would be nullified due to an "expanded use" protection decision.

Subsection 3(a)(5) lists as an element of the plan, "Forecasts of significant changes in traffic volumes, safety consequences, and environmental and economic impacts associated with scenic byway designation." Idaho feels that the Federal reaction to these parameters would supplant State criteria and would cause unnecessary duplication of effort with respect to existing Federal environmental regulations. Further, the answer to a traffic capacity problem might be to restrict travel or trucks on many highways.

The bill's environmental protection aspects Idaho feels are unnecessary because they are redundant to existing requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act and allied regulations pertaining to parklands, stream protection, wetlands, dredging and filling of waterways, historical preservation, and archeological site protection—I will stop naming items but the regulations go on—which are already in place.

Furthermore, the bill has the potential for effectively converting most of Idaho's major highways to operational Federal control insofar as eligibility of Federal-aid is concerned. It is the Idaho Transportation Department's opinion that substantial sections of all of the State's major routes would be affected.

With your permission, I would like to take this occasion to read into the record and deliver to the committee a copy of a letter from Robert K. Best, the Director of the California Transportation Department, addressed to Kermit Kiebert, Director, Idaho Transportation Department. It reads as follows:

> Dear Mr. Kiebert. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your letter to U.S. Senator Steven D. Symms on the counterpart congressional measures of S. 432 and H.R. 1087 relative to the proposed Scenic Byways Study Act of 1989. We in California share you concern over these measures, the end result of which, in our opinion, would abrogate the various State's rights and prerogatives in managing their highway systems. We believe that each State has different scenic areas not easily subject to Federal standards or criteria. It is our posture that a reduced Federal role should focus on the systems of national significance that include the Interstate and defined principle arterials serving defense and/or inter-regional commerce needs. Enactment of the subject Federal bills would prove counterproductive to those efforts. Thank you again for your courtesy and offer to comment. Sincerely, Robert K. Best, Director.

In closing, Idaho supports the concept of updating a national scenic road study but opposes Senate Bill 432 which in its present form could be a basis for eliminating State authority in scenic route designation. It also has prohibitive language that could be used to prevent use of Federal-aid highway funds for scenic road improvements. Prohibitions of Federal aid for scenic road improvements would be catastrophically detrimental to highways necessary for tourism and commerce.

We stress the need for an assurance of State decision-making powers in scenic byways designation, construction, and selection of improvement projects.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Senator Symms. Thank you very much for an excellent statement, Hugh.

Mr. John Archer, Managing Director of Government Affairs for the American Automobile Association, is our next witness. John, welcome to the committee this morning.

## STATEMENT OF JOHN ARCHER, MANAGING DIRECTOR, GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS, AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION

Mr. Archer. Thank you Senator Symms. The American Automobile Association, serving more than 30 million members, appreciates the opportunity to testify in favor of S. 432, the Scenic Byways Study Act of 1989.

AAA believes S. 432 is an important first step toward preserving our scenic roads and corridors for this and future generations so that they may explore and enjoy the America that often exists off the beaten path.

Our interest in roads that provide a pleasurable driving experience dates back many years. In 1905, AAA formed the Pathfinders, a group of AAA members who drove the country's roadways and collected information on road conditions, signing, mileage, time, and directions between cities.

The Pathfinders evolved because of a growing demand for touring information from an ever increasing army of motoring enthusiasts. Thus the link between tourists and roads was established very early.

In the 1980s, our National Travel Department was receiving an increasing amount of correspondence from members interested in "shunpiking"—shunning the turnpikes in favor of scenic roads. In response, AAA decided to designate scenic highways on all our State maps. Historical information gleaned from AAA members and clubs showed that motorists primarily wanted to drive through and to areas of natural beauty. So "Natural Beauty" became the first of AAA's four scenic route criteria and is defined as a corridor with strikingly scenic natural features.

But our members also expressed an interest in other types of driving experiences which led to the development of three other scenic route criteria:

First, quintessential scenery—best of the characteristic features of a State or region.

Second, cultural interest—architectural, historic or economic places or activities which are culturally interesting.

And third, uniqueness—usually a limited area that is unique to the region.

Recent initiatives by Federal agencies with jurisdiction over Federal lands, particularly the Forest Service, have prompted us to create a fifth criterion—Scenic Byways on Public Lands. The product of this scenic highway designation process is depicted on the map at my right, although not every designated road is shown because the scale of the national map precludes showing every road.

Scenic Drives also is a separate category in many of AAA TourBooks, allowing motorists to plan scenic drives by using the TourBooks as well as the map. For example, the Points of Interest Index for New York under Scenic Drives lists the Prospect Mountain Veterans Memorial Highway. The TourBook text describes it as "a scenic five and one-half mile drive to a crest overlooking Lake George." This reference is part of the description of Lake George, which also includes other sights and activities. Thus, the TourBook leads a motorists not only to a scenic route, but also to points of interest around it—one of the reasons AAA believes scenic roads would benefit local tourism.

The Lewis and Clark Highway located in the Clearwater National Forest in Idaho is an example of a AAA designated scenic road in a National Forest.

We think this very brief overview of AAA's involvement with scenic roads demonstrates that scenic byways and tourism are inextricably linked. Data also make this point. For example, nearly 80 percent of vacation travel in the U.S. continues to be by car, truck, or RV.

Scenic byways also have the potential to play a role in international tourism. For instance, 37 percent of foreign visitors in 1986 used a car for vacation purposes.

AAA believes that one value of a national scenic byways program may be to focus national attention on scenic roads and their potential benefits to State and local economies, thus prodding the relevant State agencies to coordinate their efforts to take advantage of those benefits.

Finally, Senator Symms, I am most happy to report that the Transportation Alternatives Group, a coalition of 12 organizations heavily involved in the so-called 2020 process, has just released a new interim report entitled, "Basic Directions for a New National Surface Transportation Program" that includes a recommendation to encourage scenic byways. This public endorsement of scenic roads by the Transportation Alternatives Group is still another indication of their growing importance.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Senator SYMMS. Thank you very much, John. I notice on your map that there is some appearance from a distance anyway of quite a lot of regionalism. I don't see any scenic highways in the midwest and Kansas. Is there any reason for that?

Mr. ARCHER. We have an extensive system which right now consists of 26,400-plus miles. It is expanding all the time and exists in every State. Some of those roads are so small they don't show up on a national map of this size. But the entire system does show up on our Atlas and it does show up on our State maps.

Senator SYMMS. I want to say thanks to all of the witnesses. Some of you have travelled long and far to get here and have made excellent statements. I thank Ms. Mitchell and Mr. Weygand, your statements were very excellent. Most everyone agrees with the statements that have been made here this morning that scenic byways do great things for the economy and for improving recreational opportunities. I think we've heard witnesses here this morning make it clear that it works in West Virginia, it works in Rhode Island, it works in New York State, it works in many other States, as Mr. Archer has pointed out. Mr. Lydston has made it clear that it works in Idaho.

What I find amazing is that it works so well without the Feds being involved, why do we want to get the Federal Government in and let them get tangled up in this and make it more complicated for the States to run good programs? That's the question, I think, that rhetorically needs to be answered.

Hugh, if some of that language were modified or just taken out of the bill so there would be no restraints placed on Idaho and California, for example, two important States in the west—do you think there are other States in the west that hold the same view that California and Idaho have presented here this morning?

Mr. LYDSTON. Senator, we received a letter from Hawaii that said the same thing. We have talked over the phone with the Secretary of Washington's Transportation Department and they are concerned about the restrictive provisions—the same provisions that we're worried about on protection.

I would like to make one extra point which I really didn't make in testimony. I was listening to the gentleman from Rhode Island earlier and others who have talked about the scenic trips. Scenic trips are all kinds of trips—there are day trips, weekend trips, and some are whole vacation trips. In the west in many cases, a scenic trip is a vacation and people engaged in that are frequently pulling trailers or they are using large motor homes or a motor home on a truck chassis and they are pulling some sort of a trailer behind them and they are embarked on a vacation odyssey on scenic highways.

I think everyone should remember that the geometrics of those vehicles to make safe turns and to operate on the curves of the highways so they don't get into a head-on collision with an oncoming car on a sharp curve, that they have the same geometry characteristics as many trucks do. So when we're talking about having to widen a highway 6 feet or 8 feet to accommodate truck traffic, we're also making a lane widening improvement that makes it safer for the tourist in that recreational vehicle. So, I think that safety and caring for people on a scenic highway is very important and that's what has us concerned is those improvements for that aspect.

Senator SYMMS. Do you know, Mr. Lydston, or any of you here, whether ASHTO has made a public statement on this or has come to a conclusion whether they favor this legislation?

Mr. LYDSTON. Mr. Chairman, we just filled out an ASHTO questionnaire day before yesterday and they have a questionnaire out right now on a revision.

Senator SYMMS. To all 50 States?

Mr. LYDSTON. Yes, to all 50 States.

Senator SYMMS. I'll be interested to hear what ASHTO says about it. It may be that there can be some middle ground on this. Those of you that are advocating scenic highways are already well into the game and are to be commended. With 31 States already promoting scenic byways, it sounds like we do have a scenic highway program underway already that works very well under current law. I always take the position that if something isn't broken, don't try to fix it. Because I do know that it is very easy to get a lot of Federal regulations tangled up in what starts out to be a noble endeavor. We can pave our highways of good intentions to lead us to more scenic beauty but let's not have our highways of good intentions leading us to hell. I hope that we can work that out.

I want to thank all four of you for being here this morning. The committee appreciates it very much.

Now I would like to call up panel III. As often happens we start running short on time, but I would like to assure the next panel who is Dale Robertson, Chief of the Forest Service and Mr. Richard Morgan, Executive Director of the Federal Highway Administration, that your entire statements will be printed in the record. Hopefully, we can take your testimony and get your views on the record and have this committee adjourn by 11:30 because I do have another appointment.

Gentlemen, I welcome you to the committee. Dale, why don't you start.

## STATEMENT OF F. DALE ROBERTSON, CHIEF, FOREST SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Thank you Senator Symms. I have a plane to catch, so I will be short.

The Forest Service is already into the scenic byway business. The National Forests, which represent about 8.5 percent of the United States, have some of the most scenic country in this nation. We provide more outdoor recreation than any other agencies. The number one recreation use of the National Forest is driving for pleasure—people just out driving and enjoying the great outdoors. We have about 100,000 miles of roads already in the National Forests that are safe for the public to drive in passenger cars.

In view of that, in May of 1988 I announced a new scenic byways program for the National Forests. In the last 13 months, we have designated 43 scenic byways covering nearly 2,400 miles in 25 States. We are in the process of designating more and I think we may eventually end up with about 100 scenic byways in the National Forest. These are roads that are located in the National Forests in areas that have outstanding scenery. We are now in the process of signing these byways and developing programs to interpret the surrounding country, history, and forest management activities.

Senator Symms, one of the points you made earlier is we do not see these areas as places to set aside and preserve. We would like to get people out to not only see the scenery, but see the management activities that are going on in the National Forests such as tree planting, cattle grazing, timber harvesting, and wildlife and fisheries habitat work.

I believe our scenic byways program has been a big success in large part because we've been working with local people in designating these roads. Local government agencies, State highway departments, economic development agencies, chambers of commerce, and private businesses are all helping the Forest Service with these scenic byways and are providing some of the funding and support for doing the kinds of things we need to do out there to an already existing road—parking lots, short-loop trails, interpretative signs.

One of the things I'm really proud of is we're forging some partnerships at the national level. I'd like to tell you about what we've got going with Plymouth. Last February, we entered into a partnership with Plymouth Division of Chrysler Corporation to help promote scenic byways in the National Forests. Plymouth will sponsor an exhibit on scenic byways in 20 trade shows this year, they will publish a nation-wide map of all the scenic byways in the National Forests and distribute that widely. The map will also be in the glove compartment of every new Plymouth sold in this country. They sponsored a major insert in the June issue of Reader's Digest, which goes to 28 million people, and there is a three-page write up and pictures of scenic byways in the National Forests. Plymouth is also sponsoring a national sweepstakes contest and you can see the poster here. Again, that will be in all of these 20 trade shows and every dealership in Plymouth throughout the country. As you can see, you fill out a little form making people aware of the recreational opportunities on the National Forests, and especially the scenic byways, and on April 15, 1990 there will be a drawing and the first place winner will be awarded a new 1990 Plymouth Acclaim, that you see there. That the drawing will be here in Washington, D.C. There are also about 1,000 other prizes. The Coleman Company has donated a Columbia camping trailer for the number two prize; Huffy Bicycle has donated 30 bicycles for third prizes; and there are other companies donating prizes. So, in all, there will be about 1,000 winners in this sweepstakes.

I'd like to say that Plymouth is putting their money where their mouth is. They, in addition, have been very generous in providing up-front funding to the Forest Service to put up signs to identify and interpret these scenic byways. I have a sample sign that is going up on these scenic byways and, basically, Plymouth is putting up the funding to make these signs and install them on our scenic byways. Incidentally, we have one in Idaho—the Mesa Falls Highway on the Targee National Forest.

In the case of the Forest Service, I think the scenic byways have been a low-cost, high pay-off program. The roads are already there, they are already paid for, and we just need to identify them, provide some interpretation, get the local chambers of commerce and local tourism industry involved, and get people out to enjoy the beautiful scenery on the National Forests. It is also low cost because people like Plymouth, the Chamber of Commerce, and the Tourism Industry are helping us with additional financing that we need to get the job done.

I'm really proud of the scenic byways on the National Forests. It is a successful program.

I'll leave it to my colleague here, Mr. Morgan, with the Federal Highway Administration, to talk about the Federal Government's position on the specific merits of S. 432.

That concludes my testimony. I would be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

Senator SYMMS. Thank you very much. That's very commendable what you and the Forest Service and Plymouth are able to do under current law. I think it's wonderful what you're doing. We welcome that byway road in Idaho.

I might just say that the hearing record will remain open until the end of July to receive additional written testimony and we will include the results of the ASHTO questionnaire. There may be some follow-up questions submitted to witnesses in writing for their responses to be included in the record.

Chief, you have a plane to catch, you are excused and may leave at your pleasure. I just want to compliment you again on your program and thank you for your testimony here today.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator SYMMS. Mr. Morgan, welcome to the committee. It is a pleasure to have you here this morning.

## STATEMENT OF RICHARD D. MORGAN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Mr. MORGAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am pleased to be here to discuss S. 432, the Scenic Byways Study Act of 1989.

I will submit my full statement for the record.

Scenic roads and the recognition of recreational driving has always been a part of Federal Highway Administration's planning, design, construction, and operational policies for years. We were involved in the planning, design, and construction of some of the nation's first truly scenic roads and parkways. Federal Highway funds have been used for roadside development, landscaping, scenic, recreational, cultural, and historic protection in varying degrees since 1934.

Senate Bill 432 would require the Secretary of Transportation to identify scenic and historic roads and develop methods for their designation, promotion, protection, and enhancement. We don't oppose the objectives of S. 432. Scenic byways and recreational travel should be studied as part of the current debate on the future of the Federal Highway Program as well as Secretary Skinner's National Transportation Policy, which is now being developed. We would not, however, support such a study if its purpose would lead to isolated pieces of legislation. We do not favor enacting isolated pieces of legislation as that only leads to a fragmented transportation program.

In summation, scenic roads and recreational driving have long been a part of the American culture. Whether or not scenic byways should be included in a national highway program or left to individual States should be a part of the overall transportation policy deliberations of the Congress, the Executive Branch, the States, and others.

That concludes my remarks. I would be glad to answer any questions you may have.

Senator SYMMS. Mr. Morgan, I was looking for your statement in here that you supported the goals but you would not support legislation which would end up with a fragmented program. Do you share any of the concerns that Hugh Lydston mentioned where he cited specific sections and language in the bill?

Mr. MORGAN. The problem with an overall Federal program could well be just what you mentioned earlier in some of your remarks. The testimony that I've heard here this morning points out that there are several extremely successful programs ongoing under State and local initiative. Of course, highways that are or can be designated as scenic highways are eligible for Federal funding of the various classes even now.

Senator SYMMS. Already? Even now?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir. If there were such a program—and I say "if" because the study doesn't presume there will be—but if there were such a Federal Scenic Byways program, I can see three or four Federal executive agencies involved in setting standards as well as some other administrative agencies involved in reviewing such standards. I really can't think of one thing that the Federal bureaucracy can add to the already successful programs underway.

Senator **Symms**. Just one other question. Senator Chafee, if you recall, spoke about fixing the road without going through all the requirements. I know there is a safety consideration, which Mr. Lydston mentioned, but is that a possibility to have a little more flexibility?

Mr. **Morgan**. Yes, sir. There is flexibility in the design standards today. There are provisions for design exceptions. It is a test of reasonableness in every situation. If you're trading off safety against environmental protection, perhaps I, as a highway engineer, would favor the safety aspects. But there are compromises that can be made. But I surely would not completely throw standards out the window.

Senator **Symms**. In other words, what you are saying is if the President and the Secretary of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administrator say that it's the Congress' wish and it is this Administration's wish that we continue to build on this base of scenic roads and byways that we already have, you think it could be done under current law with no additional legislation?

Mr. **Morgan**. Yes, sir, I do.

Senator **Symms**. I thank you very much.

The hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:31 a.m., the subcommittee was adjourned, to reconvene at the call of the Chair.]

[Statements submitted for the record, responses to additional questions, and the bill S. 432 follow:]

# Testimony of The Honorable Peter A. DeFazio
# Before the Senate Subcommittee on Water Resources, Transportation and Infrastructure
# Committee on Environment and Public Works
June 9, 1989

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate having the opportunity to submit testimony to the Subcommittee. I would like to commend the Subcommittee for holding this timely hearing on the Scenic Byways Study Act of 1989.

As you know, Americans love open country. Our ancestors' westward trek from Europe that lead to the discovery of America and our westward expansion across the North American continent are testimony to our love affair with discovery and the great outdoors.

The completion of the Interstate Highway system gave many Americans a chance to embark on their own journeys and their own discoveries. Our federal highways allow safe and convenient travel to virtually every corner of the United States.

But it's time to take our discoveries beyond the Interstate. It's time to embark on a great rediscovery of the scenery, culture and history that lies on the backroads and byways of America.

Americans from all walks of life enjoy the scenic wonders of our great land every year. More than 77 percent of them enjoy those wonders from their cars while travelling on the 3.9 million miles of roads that crisscross our country. Only walking surpasses driving as a means of seeing the unsurpassed beauty that is America.

In Oregon, travel, tourism and recreation contribute to the economic development of our cities, but more important, to our rural and non-urban areas, too. The state government recognized this when it developed a scenic byway program. Maine, Vermont, New York, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, Mississippi, Wisconsin and Washington also have programs.

Now it's time for the nation as a whole to expand the existing state programs by identifying, designating and promoting scenic byways and by protecting and enhancing the scenic, historic and cultural qualities of the areas through which those byways pass. State programs are a great start, but sound management at the federal level will ensure that our wonderful scenic byways will be protected for generations to come.

Which brings me to The Scenic Byways Act of 1989. The bill directs the Secretary of Transportation to conduct a one-year study to create a national scenic byway plan.

The bill lays the foundation for the national byway program by making it federal policy "to protect, for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations, those highways and roads that possess unusually scenic, recreational, historic, cultural or other similar values."

When the criteria and inventory for the federal scenic byways program is established, we hope to incorporate it into the next major highway bill, which is expected in 1991. If we're successful, money from the Highway Trust fund could be used to enforce restrictions on unsightly developments and to provide pull-offs, overlooks, rest and picnic areas, and interpretive centers and signs.

Our nation is blessed with miles of quaint country roads, lush forests, historic towns, scenic overlooks, covered bridges and breathtaking waterfalls. The scenic beauty, history and culture of our past and our present calls out to latter-day explorers and travelers who zoom past on our great federal Interstates.

With a little assistance from the government, those explorers would have a whole new world of scenic beauty, history and culture within the range of their sight. As William Shakespeare said, "Beauty is nature's coin." A federal scenic byways program will make us all rich indeed.

Senator John D. Rockefeller IV
Subcommittee on Water Resources,
Transportation and
Infrastructure
June 6, 1989

Mr. Chairman. I am extremely grateful to you for holding this hearing today on S. 432, the Scenic Byways Study Act of 1989, and for graciously inviting me to be here this morning to address your distinguished subcommittee.

In February, I introduced this measure requesting the Secretary of Transportation to suggest a possible design for a system of state and local scenic byways and to update a national inventory of scenic and historic roads. My bill also calls for a study of the economic impact of scenic byways on travel and tourism and case studies of those states that already have scenic byways programs in place.

I cannot personally take credit for the idea of scenic byways. The Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon Administrations all established commissions, or issued reports, calling for a national system of scenic roads. Most recently, a study prepared for President Reagan's Commission on Americans Outdoors found that next to walking, pleasure driving is the most popular form of outdoor recreation. Consequently, the Commission recommended the establishment of a network of state and local scenic byways and a federal matching fund incentive program.

You may question, if scenic byways is a good idea that has been around for awhile, why hasn't Congress acted on this subject before? In fact, Congress has acted on this idea. In 1973, Congress included a provision in the federal aid highway bill asking the Department of Transportation to study the feasibility of a national scenic byways program and to inventory existing scenic and historic roads.

Unfortunately, the Federal Highway Administration report was released at a time when the price of gasoline had skyrocketed due to the oil embargo. Our entire economy was hit by the fuel crisis, but tourism may have suffered the most because Americans changed their driving patterns. The higher price of gasoline and the long lines at the gas stations did not stop people from driving to work, but they did cut back tremendously on vacations that involve driving.

Were it not for the energy crisis of the 70s, we might already have a scenic byway program in place.

Sixteen years later, the time may finally be ripe for a scenic byways program. This committee, as of next year, will start the very important process of reexamining the federal highway reauthorization act. The interstate highway system, thanks to the visionary work of this committee and your predecessors, is now 99 percent complete.

The interstate highway system has been an incredible success in moving people and freight from point to point in the fastest way possible. It allows safe and convenient travel to almost every corner of our nation. It may be, in fact, the wisest investment the Congress has ever made in the economic growth and well-being of this nation. But few sections of this system are scenic.

The question for this committee and the rest of the Congress is where do we go next?

As the Senate subcommittee with jurisdiction over our nation's infrastructure, you now have the opportunity to assess the needs of the traveler in what I would call the post-interstate era.

The lure of the back road has been an American tradition for many generations. The Sunday drive in the country, the cross-country trip to visit national parks and forests, outings to see the fall foliage, these are American traditions which have enriched us and have helped us to appreciate the beauty of our great nation. A scenic byways program would help ensure that the beauty of those scenic roads is there for future generations to enjoy.

There is also the potential for tremendous economic benefits in scenic byways. The desire to hit the road and see America first-hand has made travel and tourism the fastest growing industry in the country. Travel and tourism is a $313 billion industry which employs over 5 million Americans, exceeding that of any other industry except for health services. It is the biggest earner of foreign exchange. For every dollar spent on travel and tourism, we get $18 in return.

Investing in that great resource -- that is, America's scenery -- should be one of the goals of the 1991 federal highway bill.

Scenic byways is the way to do this. And I'm not talking about building new roads or about creating huge expensive new programs. We already have miles and miles of scenic roads -- it's all there. What we need is to designate these roads so that the average tourist knows they exist and how to find them, and in some cases we may need improvements like safe pull-offs at scenic spots, passing lanes in hilly areas and interpretive signs that describe the culture and history of an area.

In my State of West Virginia, for example, scenic roads abound and, if properly designated, could showcase the glorious and natural wonder of my State. Scenic byways in West Virginia would attract visitors from crowded surrounding metropolises like Pittsburgh, Washington, and Baltimore seeking to get away from it all -- if only for a day of a weekend. Instead of bypassing small towns like Historic Hinton, a turn-of-the-century railroad town, or Victorian Wheeling, scenic byways would take the traveler into our communities to eat, to shop, to spend some time there and to experience rural life.

Statistics show, in fact, that our population is getting older, increasingly urban and is choosing shorter weekend trips over longer vacations. And most Americans choose to do their vacation traveling by motor vehicle.

My bill, the Scenic Byways Study Act of 1989, requests the Secretary of Transportation to recommend a scenic byways plan and update the 1973 inventory of scenic roads. The study is intended to give this committee the current information it needs in time for the 1991 highway bill.

The Department of Transportation will have several model scenic byway programs on which to base their study. The U.S. Forest Service -- and I know that Dale Robertson will tell us more about their exemplary program later today -- and over 30 states have put some type of scenic byways program in place.

I want to make it clear that the purpose of this study is by no means to supersede successful ongoing state scenic byway programs. Under S. 432, the Secretary is explicitly requested to work with state and local officials, as well as interested groups, to develop his proposal. Those states with excellent scenic byway programs would serve as models for other states. I am fully confident that, working with the Department of Transportation, we can develop a scenic byways program that is fully compatible with the state programs and I am committed to achieve that goal.

I have recently written a letter to all of your states' highway departments expressing my willingness to work with them, and with the Department of Transportation, to ensure that we obtain a valuable study and a sensible scenic byways proposal. I am sincere in that offer. And I also would truly welcome the opportunity to work with any member of this committee on both the study bill and designing a scenic byways proposal.

Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate your willingness to allow me to address this committee today and I also want to thank you [illegible] Jeffords for your cosponsorship of my scenic byways study bill. As usual, you have been extremely helpful and interested, and I am grateful to you. I would ask this committee to move this measure to a markup as soon as possible so that the Department of Transportation can start its work on this study.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SCENIC AMERICA
Formerly Coalition for Scenic Beauty

# TESTIMONY OF

# SCENIC AMERICA

PRESENTED BY

WILLIAM LEAST HEAT-MOON

Before the

Water Resources, Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee

Senate Environment and Public Works Committee

June 9, 1989

216 Seventh Street, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003 (202) 546-1100

Scenic America, a private non-profit membership organization, was founded out of a deep commitment and concern for the scenic heritage and beauty of our nation. Scenic America is the only national environmental organization solely devoted to protecting America's scenic resources and cleaning up visual pollution.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

My name is William Least Heat-Moon, I reside in Columbia, Missouri and am here representing Scenic America -- formerly the Coalition for Scenic Beauty. My views also represent those of the American Institute of Architects, the American Planning Association, the League of American Wheelmen, and a coalition of nearly 20 other environmental and public interest groups supporting S. 432 -- the Scenic Byways Study Act of 1989.

It is with great pleasure that I come before you today to address an issue dear to my heart -- the protection of America's scenic and historic back roads. As the author of Blue Highways and a private citizen who has traveled to within 60 miles of any given point within the continental United States, I am eager to share my observations about the importance of protecting our country's scenic and historic roadways.

On the old highway maps of America, the main routes were red and the back roads blue. Now even the colors are changing. But in those brevities just before dawn and little after dark -- times neither day or night -- the old roads return to the sky some of its color. Then, in truth, they carry a mysterious cast of blue, and it's that time when the pull of the blue highway is strongest, when the open road is a beckoning, a strangeness, a place where a man can lose himself.

The legislation being considered today sets into motion the steps needed to protect our country's beckoning blue highways. Enactment of S. 432 will be the first critical step towards protecting a coast-to-coast network of scenic and historic roads -- primarily those bent and narrow rural American two-lanes. The roads to Podunk and Toonerville. Into the sticks, the boondocks, the burgs, backwaters, the wide-spots-in-the-road, the don't blink-or-you'll-miss-it towns. Into those places where you say, 'My God! What if you lived here!' The Middle of Nowhere. Those roads which will attract new generations of travelers desiring to experience all the unique qualities which define a particular locality or region.

Without question, America's interstate highways afford easy passage from one place to another, but this passage comes at a price. Often, travelers have no sense of the up and down of the country; worse, our interstates hide away our people. Life doesn't happen along interstates. It happens along our country's scenic and historic roadways. Whether it's at Claudia Sanders Dinner House just outside Shelbyville, Kentucky, Ovcarik's Cafe in Dime Box, Texas, or downtown in Humptulips, Washington.

It is the need to protect the scenic and cultural resources found along these roadways which I wish to emphasize today. Increasingly, travelers in America are interested in experiencing the way of life of an area or of a city. As such, "seeing the sites" now means more than visiting the isolated museum or hiking the solitary trail. Travelers are increasingly interested in experiencing the entire culture of a region. A national network of scenic highways could become the focal point of such experience. There are many great destinations left in America but few great journeys. My father Heat Moon, spoke wisely when he said a "traveler who misses the journey misses about all he's going to get -- a man's observations and curiosity, they make and remake him." Scenic America believes that a national network of scenic highways will provide the opportunity to make the traveler's journey as exciting, as enlightening, and as interesting as the traveler's destination.

Today's backroad traveler continues to be drawn by the opportunity to experience something and someplace different from his everyday routine. In an era of commercialized landscapes, nationally franchised gas stations and restaurants, and the proliferation of look-alike strip developments, many places in America are beginning to look exactly like every other place.

Take Frankfort, Kentucky for example. Old Frankfort does nothing to prepare you for the new Frankfort that spreads over the eastern bluffs, where the highway runs the length of one of those carnival midway strips of plastic-roof franchises. Though it was past noon when I drove through, I could have had lunch from any one of two dozen frylines without knowing I was seven hundred miles from home.

As such, it is critical that the development of any scenic highway program include criteria which differentiates designated scenic highways from all other roadways found in America. Without it, roads which were once stage routes, with buildings that withstood the Civil War won't survive the economics of this century. Without scenic and cultural resource protection, surveyor's pennants will snapp in the wind, wave goodbye to the past and identify another blue road about to disappear from the map.

Oregon and Vermont are two states where an appreciation for scenic and cultural resources has emerged. Recognition of this attitude is demonstrated in tourism figures generated by the road-bound traveler. Both states identify tourism as their number one industry and both states have enacted tough standards to protect the scenery which make their scenic highways special and keep the driving public coming back.

As early as 1913, Oregon's state highway commission authorized the construction of scenic highways which would complement adjacent beauty. Beginning in the 1950's and continuing into the 1960's, Oregon used Federal assistance to help strengthen its scenic road efforts by controlling outdoor advertising and acquiring scenic easements along State highways.

Vermont's concern for preserving roadside beauty was clear as far back as 1937. The Vermont Scenic Road Law of 1977 contains a specific mandate "to preserve through planning the scenic quality of [Vermont's] rural landscape." In an effort to further define its unique sense of place, Vermont encourages tourism by providing standardized motorist information signs. Such alternative signage helps everyone. Small, local restaurants and inns benefit from getting their message across on an equal basis with the large, national food and hotel chains. Travelers benefit from receiving directions on a scale that is readable and clear. And local residents retain control over their physical surroundings.

It is important to recognize that the benefits of a well designed national scenic highways program go beyond scenic and cultural resource protection or the attraction of new tourism revenue. In addition to framing and enhancing the scenic roadways, protection of scenic and recreational areas extending out beyond the highway right-of-way should provide a host of environmental benefits. For example, the protection of streams, lakes, wetlands, unusual geological formations, and outstanding mountains located within the scenic corridor could preserve important wildlife migration routes, while still providing exciting recreational opportunities for travelers.

Secretary of Transportation Samuel K. Skinner recognized the natural resource benefits associated with scenic highways programs during his confirmation testimony, when he told members of this Committee "The criteria used for [scenic byway] designation must assure that natural resources and scenic vistas will be preserved." While a national scenic byways program might develop scenic overlooks, pull-offs or similar limited improvements, it is important that any roadway enhancements be carried out in a manner that maintains the scenic resource and respects the environment.

Today's sophisticated traveler responds to such protection, and quite frankly expects it when he visits designated scenic locations. If irreplaceable natural, scenic, historic, cultural and recreational resources are degraded or lost, travelers originally drawn to these resources will go elsewhere. The bottom line is scenic roads must be scenic, as determined by any common sense standard.

I also wish to stress that any national scenic byways program should seek to identify and protect existing examples of our scenic roadway heritage. Any funds which may be available under a future national scenic byway program should only rarely be used to develop new roadways or significantly modify roads to meet safety standards. For those cases where safety features might normally necessitate roadway redesign, the Secretary should consider safety features which do not change the nature of the scenic roadway. For instance, slower speed limits can be imposed, rather than straightening curves.

The Natchez Trace Parkway provides a good example of a roadway in harmony with the natural environment. This two-lane runs from Natchez, Mississippi to near Nashville, following a five hundred-mile trail first opened by buffalo and Indians. Chickasaws called it the 'Path of Peace' . . . During the spring, the Trace dips among redbuds and white blossoms of dogwood, curving about under a cool evergreen cover. For miles no powerlines or billboards. Just tree, rock, water, bush and road. The new Trace, like a river, follows natural contours and gives focus to the land; it so brings out the beauty that every road commissioner in the nation should drive the Trace to see that highway does not have to outrage landscape.

Without question, a national scenic highways system which emphasizes simple designations, conservation easements, appropriate signage, screening, and cultural identity will enjoy wide popularity with the American public.

When considering the adoption of a national scenic byways program, public officials must understand that if tourism development is one national objective, it requires more than public relations and mere marketing. It often requires development of traveler services. But, development compatible with scenic byway objectives requires coordination and planning. We strongly encourage any national scenic byways program to include planning assistance to local communities located along the route. Often the communities which will benefit the most from the revenue generated by backroad travelers are the very communities least able to afford the planning necessary to maintain their scenic, historic and cultural resources.

Can we do both? Can we succeed in designating scenic routes and protecting those routes from scenic resource deterioration? We know the answer is yes and the means are apparent to many communities which have already forged ahead with local scenic highway efforts. In those instances, scenic highway designation has meant the development of selection criteria and standards which include:

- o examples of the area's historic, pastoral and natural heritage;
- o scenic views from either side of the designated highway;
- o the presence of accessible recreation facilities and opportunities -- such as trails, parks, bikeways, picnic sites and boat ramps;
- o signs of minimum size to inform travelers about the area's recreational and natural attractions, services and history;
- o minimal visual blight.

The successful development of a national network of scenic byways must be predicated upon such criteria.

We believe that one of the primary strengths of the bill being considered today is the requirement that the Secretary of

Transportation develop recommended techniques for maintaining and protecting the scenic, and historic qualities associated with each byway.

In closing, let me again state our strong support for the Scenic Byways Study Act of 1989. A national network of protected scenic highways is long overdue. The economic and environmental benefits to communities located along designated scenic routes are exciting, and the prospects for wide public support are great. More than two million readers of my book have shown their interest in the sense of place provided by America's scenic and historic roadways. The travelers are ready to go, let the journey begin.

Thank you again for the Subcommittee's interest in developing a national scenic highways program. We applaud Senators Moynihan and Rockefeller for introducing this legislation. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

## FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS FOR SCENIC AMERICA FROM SENATOR BURDICK

1. There have been several studies over the years on the subject of scenic byways. Why do you believe steps have not been taken in the past to create a scenic byways program at the Federal level? Should a new study be conducted and why? Should a new Federal program be established and why?

2. Supporters of S.432 range from pavement contractors to garden clubs to RV dealers. How can a scenic byways program be structured to meet the aims of such a diverse group? How can tourism and economic development be promoted while also protecting the character of the scenic byway area?

3. Is it possible to develop uniform criteria for a scenic roads program at the Federal level? If so, please give examples of the types of criteria that should be considered. Should the criteria be established before an inventory is conducted?

4. Please comment on the merits of updating the inventory of scenic byways as required in S.432.

5. There are aesthetic concerns in setting design standards for scenic roads, but there are also safety and liability concerns. Are back roads through scenic areas less safe and in need of reconstruction to higher design standards? In addition to posting lower speed limits, are there other ways to emphasize safety without sacrificing the scenic quality of the roadway?

6. In the view of some, trees along a road pose a safety hazard. Others favor removal of trees to open views to scenic vistas. What should be considered in the decision to remove or retain trees along scenic roads?

7. Which States have especially good scenic byways programs? What are the factors contributing to their success?

8. What is your view of two existing national programs--the scenic roads programs under the auspices of the Forest Service and the American Automobile Association?

9. The 1974 scenic roads study done by the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) focused on five major issues--designation, corridor protection, complementary facilities, energy efficiency, and national connectivity. Do you see the same major issues in 1989, and if not, what do you believe the key study areas should be? Should there be any change in the study design as outlined in S. 432?

10. Some conservationists have expressed concern about providing too much access to scenic areas or historic sites, arguing that large crowds and heavy motor traffic can destroy what should be protected. How do you respond to those concerns?

11. Are there any safeguards you would propose to ensure that programs for scenic byways and environmental protection are compatible?

SCENIC AMERICA

*Formerly Coalition for Scenic Beauty*

July 28, 1989

The Honorable Quentin Burdick
Chairman
Commmittee on Environment and Public Works
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Burdick:

In response to your letter of June 29, we are pleased to augment our earlier testimony in support of S.432, The Scenic Byways Study Act of 1989.

Responses to your questions are enclosed.

We hope these comments are helpful to you in your consideration of S.432. Scenic America believes that the study authorized in S.432 will be a great help to Congress in resolving the concerns raised in your questions. We strongly urge favorable and prompt action on S.432.

Sincerely,

Hal Hiemstra

Hal Hiemstra
Policy Director

Enclosure

216 Seventh Street, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003 (202) 546-1100

## SCENIC AMERICA'S RESPONSE
## TO SENATOR BURDICK'S FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS ON S.432

1. A number of factors have mostlikely contributed to America's past failures to create a scenic byways program at the Federal level. Among the most probable factors is that America was faced with the 1973 energy/gasoline crisis precisely at the same time that the last federal scenic highways initiative was proposed. A second contributing factor is that until a 1986 Market Opinion Research Survey, it was not necessarily known that driving for pleasure is the second most popular form of outdoor recreation for Americans and sightseeing is third. This same survey revealed that 77 percent of American adults drive for pleasure to view mountains, lakes, rushing streams, and historical structures. A third contributing factor is that Americans have only recently begun to recognize the need to protect our country's fast disappearing scenic roadways and resources. This emerging national interest in protection of our scenic resources is evidenced by the fact that 20 states have enacted or amended state or local scenic highways programs since 1980.

Scenic America supports a new study of federal initiatives on scenic highways. The study called for in S.432 would build upon scenic highways studies conducted some 16 and 27 years ago. While past studies have been helpful, they do not provide answers to many basic questions. For example, past studies do not provide us with a mileage figure of how many roads might be eligible for inclusion in a national network of scenic roads. Would the figure be 20,000 miles, 50,000 miles, 100,000 miles or some other figure?

Scenic America supports the development of a new national network of designated scenic roadways. We believe that those roadways should be nominated by individual states for inclusion in a national network coordinated at the federal level. Nominated roadways would be included in the national network if certain scenic roadway criteria was met. In this way, the national network will become something special and will enjoy wider citizen interest and support.

2. The wide variety of groups supporting S.432 demonstrates the depth of interest in a national system of scenic roadways. Without question, a national scenic roadways program could be structured to meet the primary objective of all groups -- that objective being the coordination of a national network of designated scenic roadways. While all of the individual aims of interest groups supporting the development of national scenic roadways program might not be fully met, Scenic America suggests that the "greater public good," rather than the aims of individual interest groups, be the driving force behind any new program.

The goals of economic development and scenic resource protection are compatible and these goals must be pursued simultaneously if future scenic highway programs are to live up to their potential. Today's tourists continue to be drawn by the opportunity to experience something and someplace different from their everyday experience. In an era of commercialized landscapes, nationally franchised gas stations and restaurants, and the proliferation of look-alike strip developments, many places in America are beginning to look exactly like every other place. Yet, study after study has shown that Americans in general and tourists in particular respond to the contrast and unique sense of place that historic sites create and natural and scenic vistas provide.

Vermont and Oregon, two states with thriving tourism industries have successfully encouraged this industry while simultaneously passing some of our country's strongest resource protection legislation.

3. Scenic America supports the development of minimum criteria for a national network of scenic roadways. The study proposed in S.432 is designed to help begin defining what that criteria should be. Scenic America suggests that such criteria should be set broadly enough to allow a wide range of road types -- from dirt roads to primary roads -- to be included. Perhaps different minimum criteria should be established for different types of designated scenic roadways. For example, minimum tourism services might be different for a scenic roadway which is dirt than for a scenic roadway which is a primary rural roadway. Because Scenic America believes that minimum criteria should be set broadly, we believe that a national inventory of scenic roadways can be conducted simultaneous to development of such criteria.

4. Scenic America supports the updating of a national inventory of scenic roadways. Without such an updated inventory, Congress will be have to consider development of a national scenic roadways program without basic answers to questions such as: What is the potential mileage of a national network of scenic roadways?

5. The study proposed in S.432 will provide answers to the question of whether back roads through scenic areas are less safe and in need of reconstruction to higher design standards. The proposed study should also provide answers to the question of alternatives to lower speed limits. Wisconsin's Rustic Roads program provides useful examples of additional methods for adding safety without sacrificing the scenic quality of the roadway.

6. Generally, Scenic America supports the maintenance of trees adjacent to designated scenic roadways. Tree removal for safety consideration and/or the reopening of scenic vistas should be considered on a case-by-case basis. Testimony presented at the S.432 hearing by the American Society of Landscape Architects provided good examples of ways local communities are meeting multiple highway user and scenic resource protection objectives.

7. States with especially good scenic byways programs include Maine, Massachusetts, Oregon, Washington, and Wisconsin. Factors contributing to the success of these program include:

o Maine - While small by comparison to some state programs, Maine's program emphasizes the preservation of existing scenic values;

o Massachusetts - This state program is distinguished by the development of a $10 million funding program for the acquisition, restoration, and enhancement of scenically distinctive and environmentally sensitive roads and/or for the acquisition of conservation easements along those roads. Also, Massachusetts' program directors strive to work closely with state environmental agencies and nonprofit environmental/ conservation groups;

o Oregon - Oregon has a long history of inventorying, evaluating and designating historic and scenic aspects of the state highway system. Oregon has developed scenic highway definitions, policies, designation provisions, application criteria, signing guidelines and other elements;

o Washington - This state program uses a subjective identification process to identify candidate highways. This process is based mainly on the actual roadside characteristics giving emphasis to adjacent land-use planning.

o Wisconsin - Wisconsin limits scenic roadway designation to roads which do not need nor are they scheduled for major improvements that would alter the road's unique scenic characteristics.

The link clearly running through all of these programs is the identification of scenic resource values and the protection of those scenic resources.

8. The scenic highways program being conducted by the Forest Service appears to be a huge success. The forest service has identified hundreds of miles of scenic highways, identified these roads with appropriate signage, and continues to rely upon the expertise and guidance of landscape architects as the program is expanded. Because the Forest Service program addresses only roads within national forests, it should not be considered an existing alternative to the type of scenic roadway program addressed in S.432. The type of program addressed in S.432 would involve roads that do not necessarily run through federal lands.

While the American Automobile Association identifies roads with "quintessential scenery" in states all across the country, AAA's program is a private initiative which identifies this scenery as a service for association members. As such, it should not be considered an "existing national program." While AAA has identified more than 20,000 miles of roads with "quintessential scenery", AAA's program does not interface with existing state programs. Furthermore, AAA has not developed extensive selection criteria, does not provide annual evaluations of whether roads should continued to be identified as "scenic", and is not intended to be a tool for local economic development.

9. Scenic America supports the study design as outlined in S. 432. Key study areas must include designation guidelines, corridor protection, complementary facilities research, and economic impact analysis.

10. Without question, increased tourism activity could adversely affect the quality of scenic resources *if* adequate protection measures are not adopted. Scenic America believes that adequate protection can be adopted without sacrificing economic development objectives associated with scenic roadway designation. The Blue Ridge Parkway is an example of an existing scenic roadway which attracts huge numbers of tourists yet is managed in a manner which protects scenic values.

11. The proposed study should begin to identify safeguards which would ensure that scenic byways initiatives and environmental protection are compatible. Scenic America suggests that a national network of scenic roadways -- nominated from the ground-up by individual states -- which meet minimum environmental protection standards, would be the best method for ensuring compatability between scenic byway initiatives and environmental protection.

Scenic Byways Hearing

Questions for: FROM: SENATOR SYMMS

William Least Heat-Moon

1. What in your view constitutes a scenic highway?

2. Are there things, short of a Federal program for scenic byways, that the Federal government could do to encourage scenic byways at the State and local level?

3. What do you see as the advantages in having a Federal scenic byway program rather than a State program? Are there any disadvantages? Are there things which could be accomplished in a Federal scenic byways program that the States cannot accomplish themselves?

4. S. 432 directs the Department of Transportation to conduct a study of certain scenic byway issues. Is there anything else that should be included in this study?

5. What kind of traffic should be permitted on a scenic byway? For example, what effect will a scenic byways designation have on truck traffic, the trucking industry and other industries dependent on truck transportation?

6. S. 432 authorizes $1 million to do the scenic byways study. Is this amount too little, too much, or the right amount?

SCENIC AMERICA

*Formerly Coalition for Scenic Beauty*

July 28, 1989

The Honorable Steve Symms
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Water Resources,
Transportation, and Infrastructure
Commmittee on Environment and Public Works
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510-6175

Dear Senator Symms:

In response to your letter of June 29, we are pleased to augment our earlier testimony in support of S.432, The Scenic Byways Study Act of 1989.

Responses to your questions are enclosed.

We hope these comments are helpful to you in your consideration of S.432. We appreciated the opportunity to meet with you and Taylor and continue to encourage your support of the legislation. Scenic America believes that the study authorized in S.432 will be a great help to Congress in resolving the concerns raised in your questions. We strongly urge favorable and prompt action on S.432.

Sincerely,

Hal Hiemstra

Hal Hiemstra
Policy Director

Enclosure

216 Seventh Street, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003 (202) 546-1100

## SCENIC AMERICA'S RESPONSE TO SENATOR SYMMS' FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS ON S.432

1. Scenic America anticipates that the study authorized by S.432 should provide criteria for defining and designating scenic highways. In our view, a scenic highway is one which traverses unique historic, natural, pastoral, and cultural areas. Scenic America believes that scenic highway designations should not be limited to any one type of roadway. We suggest that scenic designation could be bestowed upon a wide variety of road types -- from dirt roads to interstates -- provided that the roadways traverse unique geographic, cultural, or historic areas.

2. The Federal Highway Administration has already been helpful in encouraging scenic byways at the state and local level through its publishing of Scenic Byways and through its support of the 1988 Scenic Byways conference. The Forest Service is of course helping to promote the concept of scenic highways and indirectly contributing to state scenic highway efforts. Short of organizing a national network of scenic highways, the federal government could provide technical assistance to states and local communities wishing to develop or expand scenic highway initiatives.

3. Scenic America strongly supports a network of scenic byways coordinated at the national level. Roads included in the national network should be nominated by individual states. Roads accepted into the national network should meet certain minimum criteria established at the national level in cooperation with state and local governments. State participation in the national network of scenic highways should be optional.

A number of distinct advantages would result from a nationally coordinated scenic byway program. Perhaps the biggest advantage would be the establishment of basic minimum criteria which roadways included in the national network would have to meet. As such, the motoring public would expect and receive a given minimum quality to each scenic highway trip in which they embark. Currently, a majority of the state scenic highway programs are honorary in nature and do not ensure that the designated scenic roadway will in fact, remain scenic after large numbers of tourist are drawn to it.

Additional advantages to a national program include providing technical and administrative assistance to state and local governments in planning and implementing programs; providing a method for coordinating programs among adjacent states and among state, local and federal road management agencies; providing uniform means to advise the motoring public of scenic driving opportunities, and providing coordinated national promotion opportunities.

Scenic America believes that a national network of scenic highways will be a significant improvement over the 50 states and various Federal agencies acting independently. Without this coordination, uniform minimum standards for scenic highways are not likely to be developed by states acting independently.

4. We believe that the language of S.432 is broadly enough written to allow the Department to develop a very useful study within the time and financial constraints involved. We do not believe that significant elements have been left out of the proposed study. The information generated by the study should provide Congress with critically needed data to make informed decisions about developing a national scenic highways program within the 1991 highway bill.

5. Most roads serve more than one purpose. Scenic America believes that the study authorized in S.432 will provide vital information about the possible road user conflicts which may arise on designated scenic highways. In response to your specific example, Scenic America does not advocate the exclusion of trucks from scenic highways. In those instances were trucks are not currently allowed -- such as some existing parkways -- Scenic America would support continuation of current road user regulations.

6. Scenic America does not have an adequate basis to judge whether the $1 million dollars authorized in S.432 is too little, too much, or the right amount. We suggest that the Committee accept the Department of Transportation's recommendation on this subject.

National Trust for Historic Preservation

**Testimony of**

**J. Jackson Walter**
**President, National Trust for Historic Preservation**

**in support of S. 432**

**before the**

**Subcommittee on Water Resources, Transportation and Infrastructure**
**Committee on Environment and Public Works**
**United States Senate**

**June 9, 1989**

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the trustees and more than 225,000 members of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, it is my pleasure to come before you today in support of the Scenic Byways Study Act, S. 432. This legislation represents a significant step toward improving the nation's ability to appreciate and protect scenic and historic areas through the development of a "nationwide, long-range plan for the identification, designation, promotion, protection and enhancement of scenic and historic roads." I wish to congratulate Senator Rockefeller as the leader in the scenic byways movement; several weeks ago, I was honored to have the chance to testify before his Subcommittee on Foreign Commerce and Tourism to express our strong support of this legislation.

Tourism on scenic roads is not only economically significant to small communities but also a valuable educational tool at a time when the low level of knowledge about our own history has become a national crisis. The establishment of the comprehensive scenic byways program that is anticipated by this legislation will help educate the public about American history as well as help local communities develop the means to restore and protect their historic resources.

## Why this legislation is needed

In 1989, the United States finds itself at a critical cultural crossroad. On the one hand, our citizens are in danger of losing touch with the meaning and significance inherent in our

1785 Massachusetts Avenue N.W.
Washington D.C. 20036
202 673-4000

history and multiplicity of cultures. As documented in American Memory, a recent study by National Endowment for the Humanities Chairman Lynne V. Cheney, the appreciation and understanding of our national identity and heritage has reached a low ebb: 80 percent of our colleges do not require a course in American history; over two-thirds of our 17 year olds cannot place the Civil War in the correct half-century.

At the same time, visiting historic sites ranks at our near the top of every state's survey of its visitors. Other research from the tourism industry shows that walking, biking and driving through areas rich in scenic, cultural and historic resources is a growing pastime for domestic travelers. Short vacations of three days or less now make up 73 percent of all domestic pleasure travel. In addition, as the population ages, heritage tourism is expected to increase along with the number of short vacations involving long weekends, the number of "mini-vacations" added to business travel, the amount of travel by couples without children, and, conversely, trips by young working parents using travel as means to educate their children and create from limited vacation time high quality experiences for the whole family.

These two factors -- a national imperative for more successful history education and the increase in heritage tourism -- create a need for more and better managed scenic byways. This legislation has been crafted to address these factors. Specifically, because there is no federal program integrating all of the existing scenic roadways, the survey described by this bill is vitally important. In addition, the bill is especially valuable because it recognizes the need for the establishment of standards for designation, management and protection of the scenic, cultural and historic aspects of byways as well as development of the byways as aspects of local tourism programs.

**Establishing a Scenic Byways program**

The National Trust, the congressionally chartered national nonprofit membership organization dedicated to leading the private sector historic preservation movement, recently has committed itself to a four-year heritage tourism initiative that will explore the potential for travel to our nation's historic communities. Our work in this field so far has confirmed other evidence that, increasingly, Americans travel to experience firsthand the proud history of our nation and to sample its cultural variety. They seek out not only well-known landmarks and historic sites but also revitalized commercial districts, neighborhoods and waterfronts that invite strolling, shopping and dining. They enjoy touring the countryside to savor the pace and hospitality of small town America.

Scenic byways and heritage corridors are excellent opportunities for this kind of tourism. For the traveler, they connote attractive, alternative routes and provide interpretive information about the natural and historic resources of the region through which they pass. For communities along their length, these corridors can provide an "organizing principle" to protect those important resources and coordinate tourism development.

Scenic byways can play a central role in heritage tourism. This bill, which mandates a study of the byways and directs the development of a national scenic byways program, will have a significant effect on the future of our citizens' ability to explore the historic aspects of our country. Because the study lays the foundation for the creation of a comprehensive program and clarifies the importance of the historic values of highways, historic routes and the cultural resources along their path, the long range benefits of this bill on the preservation of historic and cultural aspects of scenic byways could be profound.

The legislation anticipates the creation of a new federal scenic byways program, to be authorized for funding as a part of the reauthorization of the Highway Trust Fund. This is an entirely appropriate way to underwrite the program. It means that the heaviest users of major highways will be making a contribution toward the development of alternate routes for tourism and pleasure driving. This plan is similar to the structure of the Historic Preservation Fund (HPF), which funds the federal historic preservation partnership. The HPF takes a small part of federal revenues from offshore minerals leases and dedicates it for the preservation of historic resources, thereby allowing the depletion of one irreplaceable national resource to be somewhat offset by the protection of another kind of resource. The use of a small part of the Highway Trust Fund for the development and protection of scenic roads strikes a similar balance of public interests.

## The National Trust

Of all the groups before you today, the National Trust is probably the only one working on all aspects of this bill: economic development along with interpretation and protection of resources. These objectives advance our congressional charter to educate the public about history and to preserve historic sites for future generations. To my mind, these are not conflicting efforts but complementary ones.

Established forty years ago, the National Trust owns and manages 17 historic house museums across the nation, gives the technical assistance grants and high risk loans that make possible the rehabilitation of historic properties, and publishes a wide variety of educational materials on the whys, wherefores and how-to's of historic preservation.

We are also home to the National Main Street Center, which contracts with states nationwide to plan and implement a locally controlled approach to small town downtown revitalization that builds economic development on community assets such as historic buildings and traditional skills. Through our Main Street program, we have learned that tourism can be a means for communities to rehabilitate and creatively reuse historic structures. In addition, in our work in rural areas, we are faced with the challenge of helping communities with changing economies realize growth without sacrificing the touchstones of history and regional culture that connect the accomplishments of the past with the hope of the future. In many cases, though by no means all, this can be accomplished by establishing appropriate tourism programs.

The National Trust has developed individual strategies to protect byways adjacent to our historic properties. Our properties are important tourist destinations and can be great beneficiaries of well interpreted byway programs. One such protection effort is taking place along the Ashley River Road near Drayton Hall in Charleston, South Carolina. We are working with owners of land abutting the road to establish an easement program to protect the historic qualities of this National Register of Historic Places road, which is lined with live oaks and is significant as the approach to Drayton Hall and other historic properties.

The National Trust also has worked with local conservation groups, local governments and transportation officials to ensure the protection of the historic characteristics of roads near Montpelier, the lifetime home of James Madison, near Orange, Virginia and Oatlands, a National Historic Landmark near Leesburg, Virginia.

**The potential of historic places**

I recently had the opportunity to review remarks of Governor Mario Cuomo on the development of "greenways" and scenic byways in Duchess County, New York, which is one of the communities in the country most active in planning for heritage corridors. Speaking to the frequently heard concern that such efforts conflict with business interests, Governor Cuomo said:

> If you are going to be an environmentalist, then you are against business. Well, the world is more complex than that . . . not everything you do for the environment is negative as far as economic development. Some things like this Hudson River Greenway will be very, very good in terms of economic development. It will build the strength of the communities in terms of their being able to put people to work, attracting people who want to make money there by doing business. Just the tourism and recreational implications of it are very, very valuable.

We are learning that good interpretation of historic places is key to scenic byways. For example, the National Park Service does an outstanding job at Cades Cove, a scenic road within the Great Smokey Mountain National Park near Gatlinburg, Tennessee. This loop is designed to interpret the local agricultural, religious and architectural history through a driving tour with carefully designed overlooks and signs. Any tourist who makes this journey carries away not only an appreciation of the region's physical beauty but also a new appreciation of how and why the land was cultivated and developed in the way that it has been.

Not all of the work that we need to do to communicate the significance of our scenic and historic areas will involve putting up better signs, building scenic overlooks, or even providing such new technology as informative limited range radio broadcasts. Guidebooks, annotated maps, and other written materials can add great meaning to the passing landscape. The Smithsonian Guide to Historic America, a series of guidebooks edited by Roger Kennedy, Director of the Smithsonian's Museum of American History and a National Trust Trustee, is the newest and probably the best of the genre. For example, the volume that describes the mid-Atlantic states guides to traveler through among other places the Hudson River Valley, not only describing the history of the area but also giving helpful guidance on such matters as which parts of route 9 are scenic and how best to reach historic sites including Lyndhurst, the National Trust's house museum in Tarrytown.

The National Trust's Preservation Press has made some contributions to this field, and I am proud to give you a copy of our glove-compartment-sized book Great American Bridges and Dams which is organized geographically and gives a marvelous history of our most interesting bridges and dams, many of which I am sure will eventually have a place within a federal scenic byways system.

**Preservation policy**

Our interest in this legislation comes not only from the lessons we have learned as practitioners of historic preservation but also from our role as an advocate for the cause of historic preservation in the courts and to government.

The new policy that this bill makes represents a significant step forward for the cause of historic preservation. The bill recognizes that roads do more than string together commercial centers; they play a major part in much of our experience and understanding of our nation. For example, Route 66, which goes from Chicago to Santa Monica, is a twentieth century westward trail that brought waves of Americans to the west and deserves its own place in our history. The bill's strong assertion that it is "the policy of the United States to identify, designate, protect and enhance, for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations, certain highways and road which, with their immediate environments, possess unusually scenic, recreational, historic, cultural, or other similar values" affirms the fundamental preservation ethic that Congress put us in business to promote.

## Recommendations

The National Trust has two recommendations to strengthen the implementation of this bill.

First, any long range plans for a scenic byways program contemplated for authorization in the 1991 highway bill should include a component that encourages and enables local communities properly to plan for and manage the increased tourism brought about by the expansion of the scenic byways system. For this reason, in its report the committee should instruct the Department of Transportation to include in the study the identification of methods for stimulating cooperative approaches to regional tourism development and management and for enhancing local implementation of a tourism program, recognizing that land use will continue to be controlled by local law. These programs will help local communities benefit from the scenic byways by getting the tourists out of their cars and by knowing what tourists need. The Department should develop recommended guidelines for a program of federal funding through the reauthorization of the highway bill for this purpose; to receive federal support under the highway bill, the tourism program should be related to the nature of the local scenic byway.

Second, for communities along a designated byway to gain long-term financial benefit from it, each will have to assume responsibility for the long-term management, protection and enhancement of its own resources. In a tourism-based economy these natural and cultural resources are the community's unique and irreplaceable "product." In order to strengthen protection of the characteristics adjacent to the road that lead to its designation of as a scenic byway, we suggest that the Committee, in its report, instruct the Secretary of Transportation to develop as an aspect of the byways program a requirement of federal coordination with local governmental agencies that control land planning and zoning. The study should identify incentives for local agencies to participate in such efforts.

The National Trust is now working on comprehensive legislation designed to protect designated historic sites. The need for this legislation was made clear in last year's effort to protect the Manassas Battlefield National Park. That crisis made us believe more strongly than ever that we had to find ways to protect historic America that give alternatives to outright government ownership, a method that is sometimes too costly or impractical. We have a number of ideas, and I have asked my staff to work with the committee to investigate the ways in which some of the methods under discussion in this proposal may be appropriate for protecting the resources that will give these scenic byways their character.

## Conclusion

Mr. Chairman, as one of the Congress' strongest advocates for the preservation of our heritage, you know the importance that we as a nation place on our history. As the bill states, "77 percent of American adults drive for pleasure to view mountains, lakes, rushing streams, and historical structures, and for first-hand insights into the lifestyles of rural Americans." These resources, obviously valued by our citizens, are neither sufficiently protected nor sufficiently accessible. I congratulate you for holding this hearing to consider this bill that will enable more Americans to experience this country and its countryside; I urge the committee to take a strong position in favor of protecting what it is that makes these scenic byways so worthy of development.

National Trust for Historic Preservation

August 4, 1989

The Honorable Daniel P. Moynihan, Chairman
ATTN: Nadine Hamilton
Subcommittee on Water Resources, Transportation
and Infrastructure
Committee on Environment and Public Works
Room 508, Senate Hart Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Mr. Chairman:

The National Trust for Historic Preservation is pleased to contribute to your subcommittee's efforts to develop a scenic byways program and I was pleased to have the opportunity to testify before your committee on June 9. Attached are the National Trust's answers to the subcommittee's follow-up questions for the hearing record.

Thank you for your time in considering our ideas on this issue and we look forward to working with your subcommittee in the near future.

Sincerely,

J. Jackson Walter
President

Attachment

1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 673-4000

Follow-up questions for the National Trust from Senator Burdick

1. Some conservationists have expressed concern about providing too much access to scenic areas or historic sites, arguing that large crowds and heavy motor traffic can destroy what should be protected. How do you respond to those concerns?

Answer: There is no question that heavy use can be a stress on historic and scenic resources. However, there are ways to decrease the strain that visitation places on resources. For example, I would not advocate that major road widening designed to increase capacity be a part of the federal scenic byway program. I would advocate planning for how visitors can have a quality experience without damaging the resource. The construction of scenic overlooks, for example, can concentrate activity in certain areas in order to keep others more pristine.

2. Are there any safeguards you would propose to ensure that programs for scenic byways and historic preservation are compatible?

Answer: The National Trust has long advocated mechanisms such as buffer zones and conservation easements to protect historic sites. I would urge the Department of Transportation to work with local jurisdictions to provide incentives for sensitive land use planning and local ordinances that provide the best means for protecting the scenic qualities of their regions.

3. What criteria would you suggest for designating roads of historic/scenic importance?

Answer: The National Trust, while not in the business of designating sites as historically significant, would be delighted to participate in the development of criteria for the designation of historic byways. The National Park Service, which administers the federal historic preservation program for properties both inside and outside of national parks, works with state historic preservation offices to carry out a careful program for designating sites for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. The National Trust relies on this system for determining the significance of historic sites. It would be desirable for the Department of Transportation to consult and coordinate with the Keeper of the National Register at the Department of Interior to identify roads that pass through or nearby sites and districts listed on the National Register.

4. Has the Trust found it feasible to have national standards in the designation of historic sites? How does

the Trust take into account regional and other differences in applying its standards?

Answer: The National Park Service has carefully developed standards for a broad range of resources for assessing the appropriateness for listing on the National Register of Historic Places or as National Historic Landmarks. The application of these standards relies heavily on the work of state historic preservation offices.

5. Do you have any estimates on the potential economic benefits for rural areas if a Federal scenic byways program were established? What data exist on how rural communities have benefitted economically from historic preservation efforts?

Answer: This question gets to the heart of the research need in the heritage tourism field. Unfortunately, we do not have the data on the specific economic benefits of heritage tourism to communities, although our field experience has convinced us that the potential benefits are substantial. I would hope the proposed study would encourage such research in a variety of communities across the country.

6. In the National Trust's testimony, there is mention of a road lined with oak trees leading to Drayton Hall in Charleston, South Carolina. Trees along roadsides are seen by some as safety hazards or barriers to scenic vistas. What should be considered in the decision to remove or retain trees along scenic roads?

Answer: Decisions about how to deal with trees and other features along historic roads must be made on a case-by-case basis. The trees may or may not be necessary for the interpretation of the area, and safety may or may not dictate their removal. Often, when balancing the public interest in historic preservation on the one hand and public safety on the other, creative alternatives can be found that accommodate both. Physical barriers, speed controls and appropriate signage are among the solutions that some communities have found to address these needs.

7. In your testimony, the importance of planning and coordination with local governments is stressed. What planning and coordination lessons has the Trust learned through its preservation activities that would be relevant in developing a scenic byways program?

Answer: Through the work of our seven regional offices, along with our national staff here in Washington, the National Trust has a great deal of experience in helping local governments protect their historic resources. Because most local governments lack the expertise to deal with these resources without guidance, I would hope that the scenic byways program would provide grant funds for cooperative planning for the use of the resources along with tourism development grants contingent on local protection of the resource.

8. Supporters of S. 432 range from pavement contractors to garden clubs to RV dealers. How can a scenic byways program be structured to meet the aims of such a diverse group? How can tourism and economic development be promoted while also protecting the character of the scenic byway area?

Answer: All of the groups interested in the development of scenic byways recognize that the sine qua non of these resources is their often fragile scenic or historic nature. Thus, even if economic benefit were the only value to these roadways, protection of the resource has to be a fundamental goal of the byways program.

As I stated in my testimony, the National Trust is probably the only group appearing before the committee that is working on both aspects of the bill: tourism development and protection of resources. We have learned that not only are these two activities compatible but also that they can enhance each other. The primary need in historic preservation is the financial means for preservation and tourism brings economic benefits that can address this need. A fundamental goal of historic preservation is public appreciation of history; tourism can heighten public sensitivity toward the need to preserve our past so that we can better understand it.

ASLA

AMERICAN
SOCIETY OF
LANDSCAPE
ARCHITECTS
4401 CONNECTICUT
AVENUE N.W.
FIFTH FLOOR
WASHINGTON D.C.
20008-2302
202 686-ASLA
FAX 202 686-1001

STATEMENT OF ROBERT A. WEYGAND, ASLA
STATE REPRESENTATIVE FROM RHODE ISLAND
ON BEHALF OF THE
AMERICAN SOCIETY OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS
ON S. 432, THE SCENIC BYWAYS ACT OF 1989
BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER RESOURCES,
TRANSPORTATION, AND INFRASTRUCTURE
JUNE 9, 1989

Mr. Chairman, my name is Robert A. Weygand. I am a member of the American Society of Landscape Architects and am a partner in a landscape architecture firm doing business in Rumford, Rhode Island. I am also a member of the Rhode Island House of Representatives, where I have served for five years, and the Rhode Island Scenic Highway Board. From 1979-1984, I chaired the East Providence Planning Board.

As you can see, while I speak on behalf of the American Society of Landscape Architects, I have a good bit of personal experience and practical ideas about how well a system of scenic byways -- like the one we have started in Rhode Island -- may be able to work across the United States.

The American Society of Landscape Architects represents 10,000 landscape architects engaged in public, private, and academic practice. Our members play a major role in the design, planning and management of the land, and they share a commitment to achieving the appropriate balance between preservation and the wise use of our nation's resources.

Landscape architects -- starting with the first American landscape architect, Frederick Law Olmsted -- have long seen transportation corridors as important resources and opportunities for recreation.

Olmsted and Calvert Vaux originated the parkway, or scenic road, concept when they designed Ocean Parkway in the 1870s. It ran through Brooklyn from Prospect Park to Coney Island. Other urban and suburban parkways were developed over the next decades. In 1933, Congress established the first completely rural scenic road -- the Blue Ridge Parkway.

After creation of some of the great parkways, scenic roads were given surprisingly little attention. Now, however, some states, the US Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management are extending Olmsted's formula for recreation to their road systems. The bill you have before you today, S. 432, could be the first step towards creating an entire system of such roads across the nation.

The question of what values underlie a scenic byway is, I think, a good starting point for any discussion of scenic byways. While we can easily conceptualize wilderness and parks, the visual or scenic resources available to the user of scenic byways are much more difficult to recognize, identify, and comprehend because they do not necessarily correlate with classifications of ownership or protection.

Visual resources are all those things that can be viewed, in this case, from the byway. Depending on what agency or unit of government sets up a byway, the views could be of wilderness, forests, or parks, or even private lands with operating farms, orchards, or ranches. Various landscape forms -- great rolling plains, lava beds, and towering peaks -- give a unique character to the vistas available from scenic byways, as do color and texture. And there is great scenic value in both natural and cultural (manmade) landscapes, such as the rural landscape which evokes so much of our understanding of our nation.

Roads appropriate for a system of byways, ASLA believes, would be those where the visual quality is the highest and current usage by man, if any, is limited to historic and cultural practices that helped to shape the scene or do not substantially detract from it.

It is highly appropriate for there to be a study of what a system of scenic byways could be before we get too far down the road, for there are a great number of issues that need to be evaluated.

For instance, ASLA believes that the fundamental value that we are seeking to enhance -- visual resource values -- should not be undermined by our "improvements." While limited development along a byway may be appropriate for interpretation or visitation purposes, some types of development should be considered for prohibition. Inappropriate signage and development that interferes with the scenic character in a corridor are of special concern to us.

ASLA is equally concerned about construction standards and would urge that the subcommittee, through report language, offer the Department of Transportation some guidance on this. First, we are concerned that requirements for entry of a road into a scenic byway system might include use of certain standard highway construction methods that can damage the environment (such as extreme cut-and-fills) and should be minimized to ensure the highest scenic values along the road.

Second, ASLA is concerned that the definition of scenic byways may not be broad enough to include many corridors with high scenic values but with roads that do not meet federal highway standards.

A fundamental of the byway system should be that it is not a high-speed transportation corridor, and it therefore should not have to meet certain construction standards required for other parts of the federal system. Often these standards actually detract from the scenic qualities of a road. To insure that roads do not have to meet higher design speed standards than necessary, we recommend that system speed limits be considered, and perhaps matched to different classes of roads. (For instance, National Park Service roads may not exceed 45 mph without special authorization.)

A statement from the Senate report accompanying the Federal-Aid Highway Improvement Act of 1982 concerning park and forest roads seems appropriate in setting out what we believe should be the overall target for the other levels of a national scenic byway program:

> Roads through areas administered by Federal land managing agencies must be carefully designed to protect important natural and cultural resources under the jurisdiction of those agencies. Such roads must be designed to blend in with the natural landscape. Because of the resources preserved in the Federal land management areas, and the type of tourist uses in such areas, the roads in certain instances do not have to be constructed to normal highway standards.

State and local governments who build to parkway specifications should be protected from liability for not having state of the art, but intrusive, safety designs specified for use on full-speed highways.

In determining such standards in the study process, ASLA urges that a stronger role for the Director of the National Park Service and the Chief of the US Forest Service, or the respective Secretaries, be established. It is these officials who have had by far the most intensive role in governing what exists to date as our scenic byways system.

The American Society of Landscape Architects commends you for your interest in this legislation that will be key to improving access to and preserving many of our nation's fine scenic resources.

NEW YORK STATE
SEAWAY TRAIL INC.
SEAWAY TRAIL
SUITE 202 POUCHER HALL • STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK COLLEGE AT OSWEGO • OSWEGO, NEW YORK 13126
(315) 341-2599 • in N.Y.S. 1-800-28-SEAWY • in U.S.A. 1-800-24-SEAWY

## TESTIMONY OF SEAWAY TRAIL, INC.

on the "Scenic Byway Study Act 1989"

Presented by Teresa Mitchell
June 9, 1989

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER RESOURCES, TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE OF THE COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I am Teresa Mitchell, Executive Director of Seaway Trail, Inc. New York State is a forerunner in the American tradition of scenic touring. New York's Ocean Parkway was designed by Landscape Architect, Frederick Law Olmsted in the 1870's. Robert Moses developed the Lake Ontario Parkway and sections along the St. Lawrence and Niagara Rivers which are now part of the 454 miles of today's Seaway Trail.

The Seaway Trail was incorporated in 1978 as a private not for profit company. In 1986, New York State legislators recognized its economic potential and funded the pilot project.

The New York State Department of Transportation applied for National Recreation Trail status as the owner of the corridor. The 64 municipalities along the trail supported the request. In 1986, the Seaway Trail became the longest such recreation trail designated for mixed use/right-of-way offering multiple recreational opportunities. The Seaway Trail is a series of highway routes, but offers boating and bicycling access in many areas.

Seaway Trail is a public and private sector membership organization with over 500 members. The Trail has drawn together technical assistance and has generated dialogue from a number of agencies, businesses, and communities who share common interests with the Trail vis-a-vis future economic development, scenic resource protection and historic preservation.

Thirty-eight state parks that together include 15,000 acres of land and significant water frontage can be found along the Trail. The Department of Environmental Conservation operates 13 wildlife management areas. In addition, there are 150 marinas with over 17,000 berths, 195 boat launch sites and 88 swimming beaches. Three Urban Cultural Parks have been identified in Buffalo, Rochester and Sackets Harbor. Nearly 300 of our structures such as lighthouses, locks and churches are listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

The Niagara Power Project and the Moses-Saunders Power Dam are two major hydroelectric facilities located on the Seaway Trail. The New York Power Authority has three major facilities on the Trail in Massena, Oswego and Niagara Falls. The Power Authority is an important corporate sponsor for the Trail.

It is important that interstate and state highway systems access Scenic Byways. The Seaway Trail is paralleled and intersected along its entire length by major highway systems including the New York State Thruway and Interstate Route 81. This enables easy access for short byway tours as well as lengthier trips.

Hence, Trail benefits are not limited to the corridor but are extended for side trips in a loop or spur.

Scenic Byways create tourist dispersion, retention, and measurement opportunities. Scenic Byways connect major tourist destinations with smaller cluster communities providing economic potential to all.

The official theme -- a trail along the Great Lakes/Inland Seaway -- was developed and eight resource themes were identified. The themes are pictured on the cover of our Action Plan and are: coastal recreation, history of the coast, people of the coast, natural resources, coastal agricultural, commercial shipping, water-related industry and international coast line.

Seaway Trail, Inc., by resolution, supported the "Scenic Byways Study Act of 1989" as enacted by the United States Senate and House of Representatives. Scenic Byways offer great economic potential that can create a climate which would stimulate cooperative investments between the public and private sector. It is the hope that the Seaway Trail can serve as a case study for the Secretary of Transportation.

We feel that the future organization criteria for Scenic Byways nationwide should include:

1. Planning and development;
2. Operations and interpretation;
3. Awareness and merchandising; and
4. A funding plan and monitoring system.

Seaway Trail advocates a nationwide Scenic Byway system that includes the development of greenways which protect fragile ecosystems and scenic vistas; expansion of publicly provided tourism business management services; development of longer stay facilities; local ownership of hospitality and visitor support businesses; development of indigenous attraction and shopping facilities; coordinated efforts with state agencies and tourism promotion agencies; and the upgrading and development of new travel/recreation product offerings.

Scenic Byways will provide much needed economic growth. Tourism along the Seaway Trail has grown tremendously. Tourism-related employment reached an average of 94,843 monthly in 1986, an increase of 36% since 1976, while the number of firms engaged in tourism doubled.

Through the framework for development of the Seaway Trail, we have established goals and objectives, determined themes, and recognized specific opportunities as well as constraints for development. Subsequently, a Seaway Trail Tourism Development Plan was prepared. A Seaway Trail Tourism Resource Inventory was also completed for the ten-county area, followed by a comprehensive Seaway Trail Action Plan, of which you have a copy. Presently, three separate Tourism Development Zone plans are underway; the Trail has been divided into ten tourism zones, the criteria for delineation being physiographics, demographics, resources, themes, image and product.

In New York State, loans for tourism and retail industry are not readily available. Our tourism development recommendations outline facility requirements to become tourist clusters and destinations. Our hope is that we can duplicate the financing opportunities currently available in the Province of Ontario where capable, creditable entrepreneurs can obtain mortgage guarantees for initial development as well as for improvements to their property providing they comply with the requisites of the master plan prepared and approved for the community.

The operations and interpretation function of Seaway Trail is to upgrade and maintain the Trail infrastructure to ensure that visitors have a travel experience worthy of the National Recreation Trail designation.

The condition of the highway corridor and its improvement - including appearance - are important. The Seaway Trail features many shoulder areas which are safe for bicycling. Motorcoach and recreational vehicle use is a growing market.

In 1978, the New York State Department of Transportation began signing the Seaway Trail with green and white trail blazer signs. The signs are located every few miles as confirmation sites and at decision points along the 454 mile byway system.

A second series of War of 1812 interpretive signs are in place. These are brown and white, featuring a ship illustration. Each of the 42 interpretive signs give a brief site-specific message about the War of 1812. We call this attraction Seaway Trail's "Museum Without Walls". In 1987, New York State Governor Mario Cuomo recognized the last Saturday in September as a day to remember the War of 1812.

In 1986, Seaway Trail created two models for outdoor, unmanned interpretive information centers for the highway corridor. Each style features three panels. Panel One identifies historic sites, camping spots, and boat launches on the Seaway Trail base map. Panel Two locates the attractions and points of interest on county and community maps based on one's location, and a third panel is for local use. To date, thirty-one units are completed while another 24 are scheduled for completion this summer.

The interpretive sign program will extend to waterway sites and an awareness sign program. These interpretive units will develop a "sense of place" for each community, enabling the traveler to experience the unique cultural and historic qualities of each locale.

To assist in the interpretation of the Trail's themes, four guidebooks have been researched and prepared on the following subjects: the War of 1812, rocks and landscapes, architecture and history, and bicycling. These guidebooks are for sale as a fundraiser for future educational and interpretive projects.

The Seaway Trail, as with all Scenic Byways, offers unique viewing experiences to its visitors. A Seaway "Trailscapes" publication is underway which will encourage residential, business, and community awareness, improvement, and pride. It will discuss and illustrate eight major urban and rural landscapes along the Trail, while offering examples of appropriate plant materials and landscape designs for use in each area. This free publication will encourage Trailwide greenway enhancement by both private and public sectors.

The international loop is another unique network option. The Seaway Trail is connected at six international bridges with the Province of Ontario, Canada. The Heritage Highway is a Canadian-designed Scenic Byway that runs parallel to the Seaway Trail along southeastern Canada. A sign exchange program, encouraging awareness and usage of Scenic Byways on both sides of the border, has begun. The Canadian-American Free Trade Act will allow equal opportunity to sell products and tourism services between countries.

Unique opportunities await the boating visitor to our region. THe Seaway Trail shoreline and the New York State Barge Canal System intersect at the Oswego Canal on Lake Ontario, and to the west in the Tonawandas on the Niagara River. To the north, the Trail's waterway connects the Rideau Canal System to Canada's capital city, Ottawa. Another navigable alternative is to follow the Great Lakes westward to Duluth, Minnesota. The combination of highway and waterway connections create several multi-regional vacation options.

The visibility and awareness of Seaway Trail is crucial toward the creation of customer demand. Through the combined efforts of the county-designated tourism promotion agents and the New York State Department of Economic Development, substantial advertising has been placed. In 1988, Seaway Trail placed an eight page buy in Yankee magazine with a circulation of 1.3 million. In 1989, Seaway Trail placed a four page buy in Better

Homes & Gardens reaching 2.4 million in the northeast. Seaway Trail offers callers a toll free 800 line for response. In order to gain more consumer attention, Seaway Trail has participated in cooperative promotions with retail stores, drug store chains, and banks. Advertising purchases have been widespread to large audiences with promotions keyed to target market segments like senior citizens or specific demographic areas.

In 1987, Seaway Trail was the I Love New York Summer Festival site. Public service announcements featuring celebrity spokesman Chuck Mangione were sent to electronic media. The New York State Department of Economic Development distributed a series of newsreleases to the media and an eleven minute film was prepared for public presentation. This festival designation helped put the Seaway Trail on the map.

To reach the wholesale travel market, Seaway Trail is a member of the American Bus Association and the National Tour Association. Seaway Trail provides itinerary ideas to these organizations' members. As a member of the International Festivals Association, Seaway Trail encourages event creation and execution. Each of these affiliations helps provide fresh ideas and technical assistance to tourism businesses. In addition, we provide tourism industry member training, an essential ingredient in creating favorable travel experiences and generating return trips.

The consumer must receive a fulfillment piece which allows the reader to understand what a Scenic Byway, or specifically in our case, what the Seaway Trail is all about. Several such pieces have been created.

In 1989, Seaway Trial produced an official magazine and directory called Journey, over 50% of which is editorial. The feature story is a tribute to our nation's 1989 lighthouse bicentennial with historical narratives on eighteen lighthouses lining the Trail. Other editorial includes sportfishing, attractions for children, regional foods, the War of 1812, boating, natural history species, and a colorful photo essay highlighting Seaway Trail sights. A distribution system for the 250,000 copies of Journey has been purchased and is now in action within New York State. The major goal of this publication is to create a positive image for the Trail area while providing expected tourist information as well as high-interest stories intended to encourage longer stays.

One of the most essential elements of a Scenic Byway program is the inclusion of a monitoring system. The ability to measure consumer awareness, opinion, vacation planning and spending trends and to evaluate advertising campaigns is crucial. During the 1989-90 year, Seaway Trail plans to prepare a tourism monitoring system designed to provide pertinent information about tourists, markets, competitors, and tourism products and services.

Seaway Trail is proud of its past achievements and forecasts an even more significant growth as a result of the Scenic Byway Act.

NEW YORK STATE
SEAWAY TRAIL℠ INC.
SUITE 202 POUCHER HALL • STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK COLLEGE AT OSWEGO • OSWEGO, NEW YORK 13126
(315) 341-2599 • In N.Y.S. 1-800-36-SEAWY • In U.S.A. 1-800-24-SEAWY

July 10, 1989

Senator Steve Symms
US Senate
509 Hart Bldg.
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Symms:

It was a pleasure to provide testimony for the Scenic Byway Study Act 1989 hearing held on June by the committee on Public Works and Transportation.

At the close of the hearing, you complimented the progress of scenic byways; then asked if they are so successful, why should the federal government become involved? I would like an opportunity to respond to your concern. Also to ask that the comments be added to the testimony record.

Thank you for the opportunity.

Sincerely,

Teresa Mitchell

Teresa Mitchell
Executive Director

TM:km

"Why existing and forthcoming Scenic Byways need federal government involvement."
submitted as testimony by Seaway Trail, Inc.

Scenic Byways are presently pockets of designed highways nationwide, more in some areas than other. They are at various levels of progress with a variety of goals established by the public or private sector organization who fashioned them. Each Byway is part of the nation's Tourism network. Tourism is the second largest industry in the country.

The Tourism business consists of thousands of small businesses. They are both urban and rural. A Scenic Byway system is a mechanism to unite them and provide potential for market growth. Small business would experience a lesser failure rate with a network market structure in place.

Today's established Scenic Byways have different backgrounds. Some are public sector developed, some are private sector. Some were identified by the Transportation Departments others by Economic Development or Conservation.

A criteria to identify, maintain and enhance each Scenic Byway to a standard is necessary in fairness to the business and for the traveling public.

The United States Travel Data Center's National Travel Survey says in 1988 nearly 425 million weekend vacation trips were taken. Many trips taken may be on a scenic byway because the auto/truck/RV represents 76% of all trips taken. If each Byway has a different criteria and different methods of signage, the experience to the traveler will be less than memorable and probably not repeated. There are some aspects of Scenic Byways that need to be standardized. The character or theme of the Byways will remain unique while the structure can be uniform.

The Scenic Byway Study Act will begin to identify a Tourism Plan for the nation. It will encourage regions and states to identify tourism resources, markets, development plans, unique characteristics, recommendations and implementations. In turn, this will encourage lending institutions to recognize these tourism businesses as viable opportunities.

In summary, a Scenic Byway Study Act, through federal government support will provide tourism business synergism, positive and safe visitor experiences and a funding plan to support the tourism industry uniting the public and private sector.

American Automobile Association

Testimony of John Archer

Managing Director, Government Affairs

American Automobile Association

before the

Subcommittee on Water Resources, Transportation, and Infrastructure

of the

Committee on Environment and Public Works

on

S. 432

"Scenic Byways Study Act of 1989"

June 9, 1989

The American Automobile Association, serving more than 30 million members, appreciates the opportunity to testify before this Subcommittee on S. 432, the Scenic Byways Study Act of 1989.

Road designation is especially important to AAA. Our Association produces more than 320 million pieces of travel-related material annually, including the AAA Atlas, 57 state, regional, special area and city maps, maps of Western Europe, Canada, South America, the Caribbean and Mexico, and a wide array of TourBooks and Triptiks.

AAA believes S. 432 is a very important first step toward preserving our scenic roads and corridors for this and future generations so that they may explore and enjoy the America that often exists off the beaten path.

Our interest in roads that provide a pleasurable driving experience dates back many years. In fact, when the existing individual motor clubs joined together in 1902 to found AAA, their major goal was the creation of improved and standardized highway construction, signing of roads, and general directional information.

This goal led to the establishment in 1905 of the Pathfinders, a group of AAA members who drove the country's roadways and collected information on road conditions, signing, mileage, time, and directions between cities. The information was brought back to AAA headquarters, transformed into maps, and disseminated to members.

The Pathfinders evolved because of a growing demand for touring information from an ever increasing army of motoring enthusiasts.

Thus the link between tourists -- a word coined to describe members of early multi-car traveling parties -- and roads was established very early.

A leap of many decades to the 1980s found AAA still faced with member demand for touring information. Our National Travel Department was receiving an increasing amount of correspondence from members who were interested in "shunpiking" -- shunning the turnpikes in favor of scenic roads.

So we decided to create a scenic highway program that would be marked on AAA state maps -- once again, to provide touring information to our members.

The first problem our National Travel Department faced was the development of criteria for designating scenic roads. Historical information gleaned from AAA members and clubs on what they were interested in, showed that motorists primarily wanted to drive through and to areas of natural beauty. So "Natural Beauty" became the first of AAA's four scenic routes criteria and is defined as a corridor with strikingly scenic natural features -- canyons, rivers, mountains, deserts, forests, mesas, and shoreline scenery.

But our members also expressed an interest in other types of "scenery", which led to the development of three other AAA scenic route criteria:

-- Quintessential Scenery: best of the characteristic features or scenery of a state or region.

-- Cultural Beauty: architectural, historic or economic activities, farming, ranching, fishing villages.

-- Uniqueness: usually a limited area that is unique to the region, but differs from the general scenery.

Once those criteria were agreed upon, AAA Headquarters asked its clubs throughout the U.S. to submit roads in their jurisdiction which they considered to be scenic. Our staff of road reporters (the modern day equivalent of the Pathfinders) then drove those roads as part of their regular jobs, but also began to evaluate them as a possible addition to the new scenic highway program.

That system continues today: AAA members and AAA clubs submit suggestions for possible scenic roads, and the road reporters evaluate them and recommend whether they should be included. Since the first Scenic Byways conference in 1988, outside groups have also begun to contact the National Travel Department with possible scenic byway inclusions.

Moreover, recent initiatives by federal agencies with jurisdiction over federal lands -- particularly the Forest Service -- have prompted us to create a fifth criterion -- "Scenic Byways on Public Lands."

A fairly new AAA project is coordinating many of the scenic roads we have designated on our maps and Atlas with descriptive text in our TourBooks. "Scenic Drives" is a separate category in each TourBook's Points of Interest (POI) Index, allowing motorists to plan a scenic drive by using the TourBook as well as by searching out the AAA-designated scenic roads on a map.

For example, the Points of Interest Index for New York under Scenic Drives lists the Prospect Mountain Veterans Memorial Highway: the TourBook text reads that it "provides a scenic 5½-mile drive to a crest overlooking Lake George. . ." That particular drive actually forms part of the Lake George descriptive text, under which another scenic drive — Lake Shore Drive -- is also listed, as well as shopping areas, the Fort

William Henry Museum, the Lake George Battlefield Park, and other sights and activities. The TourBook, in effect, leads a motorist not only to a scenic route, but also to surrounding areas and sights -- one of the reasons AAA believes scenic roads would benefit local tourism.

An example of a more urban scenic route can be found in Rhode Island: that POI Index directs the reader to Ocean Drive in the text under Newport: "Ocean Drive is a 9½-mile circuit offering panoramic views of the rugged Atlantic coastline. Large summer houses border the drive." Again, since the scenic drive text is included under the general Newport descriptive text, a motorist is likely to be led to other interesting places in or around Newport -- a local tourism benefit.

As noted earlier, AAA is working to include scenic byways designated by the Forest Service on our maps and in our TourBooks. But we already have designated some scenic roads in the National Forests. For example, under Scenic Drives in the POI Index for the region including Idaho, the Lewis and Clark Highway (US 12) is listed as part of the Clearwater National Forest. The descriptive text for that forest reads: "Large stands of white pine and many miles of clear, fast-running streams and rivers characterize the rugged, mountainous Clearwater National Forest. Scenic Lewis and Clark Highway (US 12) runs a few miles south of but roughly parallel to the Lolo Trail, the Indian route across the Bitterroots to buffalo-hunting country. . .Lolo Pass Visitors Center, along US 12 at the crest of the Bitterroots on the Idaho-Montana border, and the restored Lochsa Historical Rangers Station . . . are open in the summer." Again, a motorist seeking a scenic drive may be enticed to visit other sights in that Forest.

All of this effort — the designation, the indexing, and the coordination with TourBook text — is designed to help AAA meet its goal of responding to our members' demands and needs for touring information. As you can see, scenic routes are very much a part of that touring information.

This brief history of AAA involvement with scenic roads demonstrates, we think, that scenic byways and tourism are inextricably linked. Our members who demanded a AAA program were tourists — motorists who wanted to see the USA in a scenic way rather than trying to travel from one point to another as quickly as possible.

Today, there are many benefits to be gained from scenic roads. For example, nearly 80 percent of vacation travel in the U.S. continues to be by car, truck, or RV. This is particularly important to many smaller cities and towns accessible only by motor vehicle.

The economic growth of many areas of the country, particularly economic growth produced by tourism, is dependent upon roads — many of which could qualify as scenic byways, thus enhancing their attraction. Directing tourists to scenic byways may leave them with a more pleasant impression of that state than would crowding them into a few high-density destinations. It might also help motorists on our crowded Interstates by reducing congestion on those roads.

Scenic byways have the potential to play a role in international tourism as well. According to 1986 statistics of the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration (USTTA), 36 percent of overseas and 32 percent of Mexican visitors to the U.S. that year used rental cars during their stay. That made automobiles the most frequently used mode of travel after domestic air services.

Although use of rental cars for business purposes predominated, with 48 percent, 37 percent of foreign visitors in 1986 used a car for vacation purposes.

Canadian travelers also visit the U.S. mostly by auto, usually driving their own cars. In 1986, 64.2 percent of Canadian arrivals in the U.S. came by auto. If they are members of our Canadian clubs and the Canadian Automobile Association, they are probably familiar with scenic byways -- AAA also designates scenic roads on our Canadian maps.

In developing its scenic byways program, AAA noticed that while some states actively designate and promote their scenic roads, many other states seem to have little or no coordination between their tourism promotion agency and their state department of transportation on whether the state has designated any roads and whether those roads are or should be promoted and marketed. It seems that many states may be unaware of the recreational and tourism opportunities provided by scenic roads.

AAA believes that one value of a national program may be to simply focus national attention on scenic roads and their potential benefits to state and local economies, thus prodding the relevant state agencies to coordinate their efforts to take advantage of those benefits.

Mr. Chairman, AAA appreciates this opportunity to testify on this issue and hopes our statement today may be of use to you, your Subcommittee, and the scenic roads movement generally.

STATEMENT OF
F. DALE ROBERTSON, CHIEF
FOREST SERVICE
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Before the
Subcommittee on Water Resources, Transportation, and Infrastructure
Committee on Environment and Public Works
United States Senate

Concerning Scenic Byways

June 9, 1989

MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Forest Service scenic byways program.

The National Forests are America's Great Outdoors! Representing the prime outdoor recreation lands in this country, the National Forests provide recreation for more people than any other public lands.

The number one recreation use of the National Forests is driving for pleasure--people out driving for the fun of it, enjoying the scenery and the great outdoors, the majestic mountains and powerful rivers, the quiet lakes and tranquil forests, the rural towns, the wildlife and the seashores. Many of these roads go through the 156 National Forests in 43 States.

In May 1988, I announced a new scenic byways program for the National Forests.

Over the last 13 months, I have designated 43 National Forest Scenic Byways covering nearly 2,400 miles in 25 States. And I expect to designate many more byways--perhaps eventually ending up with as many as 100. These are existing roads located primarily on National Forests in areas having outstanding scenery. We are now in the process of signing these byways and developing programs to interpret the surrounding country, history, and forest and range management activities. In addition to beautiful scenery, visitors will see National Forest management activities like timber harvesting, tree planting, cattle grazing, and fish and wildlife habitat improvement work.

Ultimately, I would like to see tourists get involved with these activities by doing something, such as planting a tree on a National Forest, so that they can go back home and know for the rest of their lives that "their" tree is growing on "their" National Forest. I also envision, in selected areas, that the Forest Service will work with local people to explain the many uses of the National Forests. For example, someone could show and explain logging or ranching operations. There are a lot of retired people out there who know the business and who might be willing to serve as volunteer interpretive guides. They could explain what various activities on the National Forests are all about, and help people get involved in a hands-on sort of way.

There is no limit to what can be done along scenic byways to enrich the experience of the tourist. It is only limited by what local people are willing to do in teaming up with the Forest Service. And it appears that many local people are ready to help out.

Our scenic byways program on the National Forests has been a big success in large part due to local people working together with local Forest Service personnel. Local government agencies, State highway departments, economic development agencies, chambers of commerce, and private businesses are all helping publicize local scenic byways and are providing some of the necessary developments, such as overlooks, interpretative signs, rest stops, and short-loop trails.

Scenic byways are a natural catalyst for building these kinds of partnerships. Local people see scenic byways as a drawing card for boosting the local economy through tourism. But perhaps a more significant reason that local people are willing to participate is that they often have a very strong identity with "their" National Forest.

At the national level, large-scale partnerships are being forged with major firms and organizations. For example, in February, we entered into an relationship with the Plymouth Division of the Chrysler Corporation, through a partnership with the Forest Education Foundation, to help promote scenic byways. Through the Foundation, Plymouth will sponsor an exhibit on scenic byways in more than 20 trade shows and publish a nationwide map of scenic byways. They will also fund the development of interpretive signs and audio cassette tours. They sponsored a major insert on National Forest scenic byways in the June issue of Readers Digest. In addition, they have been generous in providing upfront funding to help put up signs to identify and interpret scenic byways.

In the case of the Forest Service, the scenic byways program has been a low cost, high payoff program. What I am most proud of is how the local people have rallied around our scenic byways. They have been willing to pitch in and help the Forest Service get the job done, and that is why the program is a success.

We defer to the Department of Transportation on the merits of S. 432, and understand that they will provide comments on the bill to this Committee for its consideration.

This concludes my testimony. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD D. MORGAN
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

HEARING BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER RESOURCES,
TRANSPORTATION, AND INFRASTRUCTURE
COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS
UNITED STATES SENATE

S. 432
"Scenic Byways Study Act of 1989"

June 9, 1989

Good Morning, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I am Richard D. Morgan, Executive Director of the Federal Highway Administration. I am pleased to be here this morning to discuss S. 432, the, "Scenic Byways Study Act of 1989".

Scenic roads and the recognition of recreational driving has always been a fundamental part of FHWA's highway planning, design, construction and operational policies. Our predecessor agencies were involved with the planning, design and construction of some of our Nations first truly scenic roads and parkways. The FHWA and the Bureau of Public Roads, have long endorsed the protection and preservation of scenic, recreational, cultural and historic qualities of our highway systems for both the Federal and Federal-aid highways. Federal-aid highway funds have been used for roadside development, landscaping, and for scenic, recreational, cultural and historic protection to varying degrees since 1934.

In the early 1960's, the Bureau of Public Roads in cooperation with other agencies made an exhaustive study of scenic roads and parkways for the President's Recreation Advisory Council. Scenic roads and highway beautification was a major agenda for the 1965 White House Conference on Natural Beauty, which subsequently prompted the Highway Beautification Act of 1965. At the direction of the Congress, the FHWA in cooperation with the States completed a study in 1974 to investigate the feasibility of developing a national scenic highway system. Following these efforts, nothing further was done because of competing budgetary and policy demands. However, the several programs which were in place at the time continued. Categorical funding for some of the programs was discontinued, but Federal-aid highway funds remain available for rehabilitation of highways leading to or in conjunction with scenic, recreation, historic and cultural development and preservation activities.

The 1986 President's Commission on Americans Outdoors (PCAO) expressed the importance of outdoor recreation and its relationship to recreational travel. To further investigate the recommendations of the PCAO, a National Conference on Scenic Byways was held in May 1988 in Northern Virginia. The FHWA, AASHTO and several State Highway Departments participated in the Scenic Byways '88 Conference along with many other Agencies, organizations and interest groups. The conference workbook which was developed by the FHWA as a reference document was a major contribution to the success of the Scenic Byways '88 Conference. Since the conference and because of many requests, the FHWA printed and has distributed over 8,000 copies of the handbook. The FHWA continues to handle many requests for other technical materials and assistance.

The current legislation authorizing the Federal-aid highway program will expire in 1991. To help "map" future highway transportation policies and plans, the FHWA and the transportation community have for some time now been examining the capacity of our Nation's highway system, its economic importance to growth and mobility, and the transportation and travel demands that we will be confronted with over the next several decades. While we recognize many competing demands, we are also cognizant of the need to balance transportation with economic, social and environmental considerations. Along with mobility and safety, there are many other important factors that must be taken into account. The type of travel, be it business, work, family-related, or recreational, and the community in which it is performed will decide the aesthetic qualities, the cultural essences, and the historical values.

Scenic byways and recreational travel are important to an overall transportation planning process, and we support their consideration. Travel surveys show that driving for pleasure and recreation accounts for a significant part of total trip making and ranks second as a popular outdoor activity. Tourism is also an important part of the economy, particularly to the rural areas, and the importance of good transportation systems which enhance cultural, historic and aesthetic qualities are important considerations in transportation planning.

S. 432 would require the Secretary of Transportation to identify scenic and historic roads and develop methods for their designation, promotion, protection, and enhancement. We do not oppose the objectives of S. 432. Scenic byways and recreational travel should be studied as part of the current debate on the future of the highway program as well as Secretary Skinner's national transportation policy which is now being developed. We would not, however, support such a study if its purpose will lead to an isolated piece of legislation.

With regard to agency responsibilities, the Department of Commerce would be better suited than the Department of Transportation to conduct the economic studies required under section 4, Economic Impact and Tourism Development. Under section 3 of S.432, the Secretary of Transportation is required to offer "several alternative proposed national scenic byways programs" for consideration of the Congress. This provision should be eliminated. The Secretary should have the flexibility of offering no alternatives if the results of the study indicate that a national scenic byways program is not needed.

In summation, scenic roads and recreational driving have long been a part of the American culture. Whether or not scenic byways should be included in a national highway program or left to individual States should be a part of the overall transportation policy deliberations of the Congress, the Executive branch, the States and others.

That concludes my statement. I would be happy to answer questions you may have.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

OFFICE OF
THE ADMINISTRATOR

July 31, 1989

IN REPLY REFER TO:

HCC-10

The Honorable Daniel P. Moynihan
Chairman, Subcommittee on Water Resources,
Transportation and Infrastructure
Committee on Environment and Public Works
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Moynihan:

Enclosed are the follow-up questions from the hearing on S. 432, the "Scenic Byways Study Act of 1989", held on June 9, 1989, before your Subcommittee. Please contact me if I can be of further assistance in the deliberations on this bill.

An identical response has been provided to Senator Steve Symms.

Sincerely yours,

Gene McCormick

Gene McCormick
Deputy Administrator

Enclosure

Senator Burdick

QUESTION NO. 1

If a Federal scenic byways program were established, what are the funding alternatives? Please estimate the cost of such a program?

ANSWER

There are several possible alternatives for funding a possible scenic highways program, including a specific authorization; a set aside from selected Federal-aid programs (similar to the current Highway Planning and Research Program); or a special revolving fund. However, it would be premature to select one of these or any other alternative until the scope and extent of scenic highways "needs" are known. The inventory called for in S. 432 could provide a basis for making that determination.

July 13, 1989
HPP-24

QUESTION NO. 2

**Apart from the economic studies mentioned in FHWA's testimony, does DOT have the capability internally to perform the study as described in S. 432? If not, would the study be subcontracted? How much funding is needed for the study?**

ANSWER

We have the capability to carry out such studies, but cannot accomplish them within the time constraints of the bill. We believe the economic studies would more appropriately belong to the Department of Commerce to conduct, but, if FHWA were to have the responsibility, it would have to be contracted out. We estimate the cost at $2,000,000.

July 13, 1989
HPP-24

QUESTION NO. 3

The 1974 scenic roads study done by the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) focused on five major issues--designation, corridor protection, complementary facilities, energy efficiency, and national connectivity. Do you see the same major issues in 1989, and if not, what do you believe the key study areas should be?

ANSWER

The five issues identified in the 1974 study are still important in 1989. Another significant consideration at this time, however, is cost.

July 13, 1989
HPP-24

QUESTION NO. 4

The General Accounting Office (GAO) has been asked to determine criteria for the designation of scenic byways and conduct case studies of State scenic byways programs. How would the DOT study mesh with GAO's efforts?

ANSWER

Any study carried out by DOT would take into account work that has been done by any other agency, including GAO. We would not want to duplicate the efforts of others, unless it was necessary to complement those efforts and to fill in any gaps.

July 13, 1989
HPP-24

QUESTION NO. 5

**Are proposals for creation of a Federal scenic byways program being considered in connection with the development of DOT's national transportation policy?**

ANSWER

It is too early to answer this question because the Department is still in the "fact finding or information gathering" phase of the policy's development.

July 13, 1989
HPP-24

QUESTION NO. 6

Have you seen the results of the scenic byways survey conducted by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO)? If so, do you have comments on the AASHTO survey?

ANSWER

We are aware of the survey, but have not studied the findings extensively. To the extent that we may be called upon to carry out the inventory in S. 432, we expect to work closely with AASHTO and take advantage of the work that organization has done.

July 13, 1989
HPP-24

QUESTION NO. 7

Is it possible to develop uniform criteria for a scenic roads program at the Federal level? If so, please give examples of the types of criteria that should be considered. Should the criteria be established before an inventory is conducted?

ANSWER

My initial reaction is that it would be extremely difficult to establish uniform criteria at the Federal level because the very term, "scenic roads," can mean so many different things to different people. However, once an inventory is conducted, a clearer picture may emerge concerning how to identify scenic roads and, thus, be able to establish criteria.

July 13, 1989
HPP-24

QUESTION NO. 8

S. 432 requires an updated inventory of scenic byways. Please comment on that provision.

ANSWER

As I have alluded to previously, the inventory could provide information that could help determine if a separate scenic roads program is needed or the type of program that is most appropriate. However, the inventory should be more than just a listing of highways. It should include a description of the physical characteristics of the highway corridor and how it is used.

July 13, 1989
HPP-24

QUESTION NO. 9

**Some States have been concerned about the possibility of a Federal scenic byways program taking funds from the regular Federal-aid highway program and imposing additional Federal standards or requirements on the States. Do you think those concerns are justified? Are the potential benefits significant enough to outweigh such concerns?**

ANSWER

Yes, I believe those concerns are justified. The Federal-aid highway program is financed almost entirely by the Highway Trust Fund. To the extent any program or activity other than the categories in the Federal-aid highway program are paid for from the Trust Fund, the financing of the Federal-aid categories must be reduced. The potential benefits may vary from location to location. For this reason, it may be appropriate to leave it to the States to determine what the priorities are. This essentially is the way scenic highways are presently funded, since scenic roads that are on the Federal-aid system are eligible for Federal-aid funds.

July 13, 1989
HPP-24

QUESTION NO. 10

If a scenic byways program is not created at the Federal level, is there a danger that the Nation will be unable to preserve its scenic and historic roads?

ANSWER

It certainly has not been the case so far. It is possible that a few scenic roads might not be fully developed or improved. It is also possible that, given limited resources and difficult decisions to balance competing highway needs, most people might not want all of these roads fully improved.

July 13, 1989
HPP-24

## QUESTION NO. 11

**What is your view of two existing national programs--the scenic roads programs under the auspices of the Forest Service and the American Automobile Association?**

## ANSWER

They both provide a valuable service to the motoring public, especially to the recreational motorists. The AAA has been identifying scenic routes for years on their maps and on their individually prepared "Trip Maps." The Forest Service is now providing roadside signs and markings to identify designated scenic routes. Both of these agencies are keeping scenic roads in the minds of the motorists.

July 13, 1989
HPP-24

QUESTION NO. 12

**Should the emphasis of a scenic byways program be on existing or new roads? How much improvement or upgrading would be required on existing roads?**

ANSWER

The emphasis of such a program should be on enhancing existing roads. How much improvement or upgrading would be needed is difficult to determine in the absence of an inventory that includes the information identified earlier.

July 13, 1989
HPP-24

QUESTION NO. 13

**There are aesthetic concerns in setting design standards for scenic roads, but there are also safety and liability concerns. Are back roads through scenic areas less safe and in need of reconstruction to higher design standards? How can safety be emphasized without sacrificing the scenic quality of the roadway?**

ANSWER

The kind of tradeoffs alluded to here illustrate why it is difficult to have a uniform criteria or standard for scenic highways. Many scenic roads could be improved to higher design standards, but, in doing so, the scenic quality could be lost in some cases. These need to be looked at on a case by case basis and, again, this should be done by the States.

July 13, 1989
HPP-24

QUESTION NO. 14

**In the view of some, trees along a road pose a safety hazard. Others favor removal of trees to open views to scenic vistas. What should be considered in the decision to remove or retain trees along scenic roads?**

ANSWER

In some cases, removal of trees along a road may both enhance the road's safety and scenic quality. In other cases, removal may make the road safer, but ruin the scene. Again, each State needs to decide based on its overall scenic roads policy.

July 13, 1989
HPP-24

QUESTION NO. 15

**Which States have especially noteworthy scenic byways programs? What are the factors contributing to their success?**

ANSWER

Several States have successful scenic byways programs, including California, Idaho, Oregon, Tennessee, and New York. The States of Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, and Wisconsin (with the Province of Ontario) together are establishing circle tours around Lakes Michigan and Superior on scenic highways. These programs seem to be successes because of careful planning and a commitment on the part of the States, other governmental units, the private sector, interest groups, and the public to initiate, implement, and continue a scenic byways program. Public education and awareness about the scenic routes, including their locations, amenities, and their purpose all play a role in how well the routes are accepted, utilized, and supported. Cooperation between units of government and between public and private sectors is also important to the success of the scenic byways programs.

July 13, 1989
HPP-24

QUESTION NO. 16

**There have been several studies over the years on the subject of scenic byways. Why do you believe steps have not been taken in the past to create a scenic byways program at the Federal level? Should a new study be conducted and why? Should a new Federal program be established and why?**

ANSWER

Many scenic highways have been and are part of the Federal-Aid Highway Program and thus, have been eligible for Federal-aid funding. Other scenic roads have received funding from other Federal agencies, from State highway agencies and other sources. It has not seemed necessary to have a special scenic highways program. It is premature to state whether a new Federal program is necessary until Secretary Skinner's national transportation policy is completed. It would appear that sufficient information may be at hand that a new study is not needed.

July 13, 1989
HPP-24

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY
AND TRANSPORTATION OFFICIALS

JAMES P. PITZ, President
Director
Michigan Department of
Transportation

FRANCIS B. FRANCOIS
Executive Director

July 5, 1989

The Honorable Quentin Burdick, Chairman
Committee on Environment and Public Works
SD-458 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Mr. Chairman:

We are pleased to forward to you a summary response to our recent survey questionnaire on the scenic byways study. S. 432. This survey questionnaire was developed at the request of the Committee staff members and we are happy to be able to respond to their inquiry.

If we can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to call on us.

Very truly yours,

Francis B. Francois
Executive Director

FBF:BKH:mlm

Enclosures

cc: Senator John D. Rockefeller

EXECUTIVE OFFICE: 444 N. Capitol St., NW, Suite 225, Washington D.C. 20001
Telephone (202) 624-5800 Telefax (202) 624-5806 Telex 4900009580 HTO

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION OFFICIALS
444 N. Capitol St. N.W. - Suite 225
Washington, D.C. 20001

June 30, 1989

## RESULTS OF SURVEY ON SCENIC BYWAYS

### Introduction

The U.S. Senate is considering S. 432, the "Scenic Byways Study Act of 1989," and staff members of the Committee on Environment and Public Works requested AASHTO to obtain information from its member departments on certain questions related to the bill. The questions posed are as follows, and the survey results are stated after each question. The total number of member departments responding to the date of this report is 43.

1. Does your state have a "Scenic Byways" program?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Region I | 5 | yes | 6 | no |
| Region II | 4 | yes | 7 | no |
| Region III | 2 | yes | 6 | no |
| Region IV | 6 | yes | 7 | no |
| Total | 17 | yes | 26 | no |

Region I:

**District of Columbia:** "As the District of Columbia is wholly urban, a scenic byways study as described in S.432 is not applicable."

Region II:

**Mississippi:** "The Legislature has established a number of scenic routes. These are designated by sign-only with no provision for preservation or protection."

Region III:

**Iowa:** "See attachment."

**Wisconsin:** "Not as such, but programs with similarities are": (listed below under response to Question 2)"

Regions IV:

**South Dakota:** "South Dakota is in the process of developing a Policy & Procedure for State Designation of Scenic Byways."

2. If the answer to Question 1 is "yes," please provide a brief description of the program, for the use of the Committee.

Region I:

**Connecticut:** "The Connecticut Scenic Road Program provides procedures to designate State owned roads as scenic and establishes special construction and maintenance standards for such designated roads."

**Maine:** "A 1969 law created a Scenic Highway Board. Legislation in 1972 assigned responsibility for establishing a system of scenic highways to the Maine Dept. of Transportation. Major criteria include quality of the scenic, cultural and historic attractions on the highway to be considered. Other criteria include accessability to population centers, recreation areas, etc."

**Maryland:** "Routes (primarily state roads) which are scenic are identified as scenic routes with designated signage. We do not propose controls for these routes."

**Massachusetts:** "The Massachusetts Dept. of Public Works has an Open Space Program with a $17.5 million budget from the 1985 and 1988 Transportation Bond Issues to acquire scenic vistas adjacent to public ways in order to 'preserve, restore or enhance' these parcels.

"In addition, the state has Scenic Highways legislation, a copy of which is enclosed."

**New Hampshire:** "Not applicable."

**New York:** "In New York, the concern for visual resources is demonstrated by Article 49 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law, which permits the preservation of scenic resources in the state, including those along its roads. The NYS Dept. of Environmental Conservation (DEC) has fulfilled the intent of the law by initiating the Scenic Roads Program and developing a manual that assures a consistent process for designating roads and a management plan for the 'protection, preservation and enhancement.'"

Region II:

**Arkansas:** "We have developed a system of identified 'Scenic Highways' and indicate them by unique symbols on the state highway map. Additions or deletions to the system require state legislative action."

**Louisiana:** "We have a Legislative program which establishes State highways as trails for historic or scenic purposes. The program is not well defined and includes only a few trails at this time. Special route signing is provided by local support."

**North Carolina:** "North Carolina's Scenic Byways Task Force (with membership comprised of the Department of Transportation, the Department of Commerce's Division of Travel & Tourism, and the Department of Cultural Resources' State Historic Preservation Office) is developing a scenic byways program which will include guidelines and criteria for designation, administration, and maintenance and repairs. An inventory of visual resources along the state's highways is currently underway to provide the basis for designation of a number of routes which will be proposed as the state's first scenic byways in a pilot program later this summer."

**Tennessee:** "Tennessee has approximately 2300 miles of state highways designated as Scenic Parkways. These are primarily 2-lane highways providing alternate routes to highly traveled roads and serving the state's historic, recreational, scenic and major tourist areas. The system was established by state legislation in 1982."

**Virginia:** "The program is a mechanism for officially recognizing unique road corridors with the purpose of conserving them for the enjoyment of travelers. It is a joint program of the Department of Conservation and Historic Resources and the Department of Transportation."

Region III:

**Illinois:** "Although Illinois does not have an active 'Scenic Byways' program, Illinois does have the scenic Great River Road along the Mississippi River and preserves scenic segments of highways on a case by case basis."

**Michigan:** "MDOT presently has drafted legislation for the establishment of a system of highways similar to the Scenic Byways concept. The legislation, being prepared for submittal this fall, will provide for the designation of certain portions of the state highway system as Michigan Heritage Routes, including scenic, historic, and recreational routes."

**Minnesota:** "We currently are developing a final plan responding to Minnesota Statue 160.81 'Highways in Recreation Areas,' which includes a method of identifying Unique and Scenic Highway Segments which could be designated by Mn/DOT or local units of government."

**Missouri:** "We have just initiated a program and are in the formulative stage."

**Wisconsin:** "o Scenic easement program funded under ORAP by which over 16,000 acres have been protected on scenic highways;

o The Scenic Highways program which provided symbols to identify 196 different resources;

o The Circle Route program identifying scenic routes along the Great Lakes;

o Wisconsin's Rustic Roads Program with 54 designated routes;

- o Wisconsin's Great River Road;
- o Wisconsin's Auto Tours."

Region IV:

**Arizona:** "The program was established in 1982 and legislation passed that provides for the designation of Parkways, Historic and Scenic Roads. The Arizona Department of Transportation is the responsible agency for implementation of the legislation. A total of eight routes with over 390 miles have been designated to date."

**California:** "Please see attached 'Guidelines for the Official Designation of Scenic Highways.'"

**Colorado:** "Colorado recently created a Scenic and Historic Byways Commission whose mission is to guide the development of a network of Colorado roadways which have exceptional scenic, ecological, cultural and historic attributes. In the coming months, the Commission will develop criteria for designation of scenic and historic byways, evaluate nominations, make recommendations for designation, coordinate the State's program with other federal agencies such as the US Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management (BLM), develop funding sources and support promotional and interpretive programs for designated scenic and historic byways (See attached Executive Order).

"The Commission is composed of representatives from Federal, State, and local governments, private museums, organizations and interested citizens. All parts of the State are represented by the Commission. To date, the Commission has met twice and is in the process of developing criteria for selection of scenic and historic byways, and procedures and policies for nominations. Signage for scenic byways is also being addressed at these initial meetings."

**Oregon:** "Oregon has a program called 'The Oregon Historic and Scenic Highway Program.' This program was established to preserve certain designated highways or highway-related structures for their historical, engineering, recreational, scenic and tourism significance. The program is monitored by the Oregon Department of Transportation."

South Dakota: "A 'draft copy' is attached."

**Texas:** "But at one time, Texas State Department of Highways and Public Transportation (SDHPT) had a plan for historic and scenic trails throughout Texas, but the plan was phased out due to lack of funding."

Utah: "Please see attached."

**Washington:** "Attached -- but is unfunded -- hence little 'development' activity."

3. Would your state support a federal "Scenic Byways" program such as that suggested in S. 432?

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Region I | 4 | yes | 6 | no | | |
| Region II | 5 | yes | 5 | no | | |
| Region III | 7 | yes | 1 | no | | |
| Region IV | 5 | yes | 6 | no | | |
| Total | 21 | yes | 18 | no | 4 | unanswered |

Region I:

**Connecticut:** "We support the intent of the bill, but the bill is too general to see what kind of impact it would have on our State Transportation Improvement Program."

Region II:

**Georgia:** "See attachment."

**Kentucky:** "Yes, with changes."

**North Carolina:** "We prefer that the states be able to set their own standards and guidelines with perhaps federal minimum standards that would not bind or constrict individual states from choosing routes of local or statewide aesthetic, cultural, historical or natural significance."

**Virginia:** "Possibly, (see response to question 6)."

Region III:

**Wisconsin:** "Support in principle."

Region IV:

**Alaska:** "We did not see where S.432 suggested a specific 'Scenic Byways' program."

**Colorado:** "We are supportive of a Federal 'Scenic Byways' program that avoids guidelines for states and all Federal agencies."

**Nevada:** "Yes, with modifications."

**Utah:** "See response to Question 6."

**Washington:** "This would essentially duplicate our scenic program."

4. Should there be national standards for scenic byways?

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Region I | 3 | yes | 8 | no | | |
| Region II | 6 | yes | 5 | no | | |
| Region III | 4 | yes | 3 | no | | |
| Region IV | 6 | yes | 6 | no | | |
| Total | 19 | yes | 22 | no | 2 | unanswered |

Region I:

Connecticut: "It is unclear whether standards pertain to designation, scenic quality or the actual roadway. We feel each state has different resources and traffic conditions which do not lend themselves to a national standard."

Region II:

Mississippi: "Guidelines maybe, but no standards."

North Carolina: "Only, if these were for routes of National significance in the individual states -- such as US Route 66 or the George Washington Parkway."

Virginia: "Yes, if a program is legislated."

Region III:

Illinois: "See response to Question 5."

Region IV:

Colorado: "Yes, however we would prefer guidelines rather than rigid standards."

Utah: "A common safety standard is important."

5. If there should be such standards, what does your member department suggest?

Region I:

D.C.: "None."

Maine: "Support only in the context of the AASHTO 2020 effort on highways of national significance. Designation of scenic highways is best done at the state level."

Maryland: "Each state should determine criteria appropriate for that particular geographic/historic/cultural area. National guidelines may be appropriate."

New Hampshire: "Guidelines should be issued by AASHTO however they should not be mandatory."

**Rhode Island:** "Copy of draft rules of procedure and evaluation criteria are attached."

**Region II:**

**Arkansas:** "Standards that would assure uniform quality nationwide. With such assurance, a system of scenic byways would attract tourists and enhance economic development."

**Georgia:** "See attachment."

**Kentucky:** "Standards consistent with other existing scenic routes in national parks, etc."

**Louisiana:** "a. Qualifying criteria
b. Standards for type highway, quality of riding surface and maintenance
c. Requirements for oversight responsibility."

**North Carolina:** "The chosen routes should have national significance historically, culturally and naturally, and have the highest aesthetic standards possible."

**Virginia:** "The facility links together or provides access to significant scenic, scientific, historic or recreational points."

**Region III:**

**Illinois:** "The Scenic Byways Program should be more clearly defined before standards are developed. If national standards should be developed, care should be taken so that the features that made a road a scenic byway are not compromised."

**Michigan:** "Criteria should be established for the location and length of routes and adjacent areas requiring continuing and careful coordination of planning, design, construction, maintenance, land use, and development, by state and local agencies as appropriate, to encourage adjacent land use consistent with the intent of the designation. Furthermore, planning, design, reconstruction, and maintenance of all designated routes should be governed by criteria to ensure that these routes are reasonably safe and fit for travel while preserving the unique characteristics that qualify them as heritage routes. (Specific criteria are available upon request.)"

**Minnesota:** "Program goals that insure consistency for designation and implementation similar to the Great River Road Program."

**Missouri:** "We currently are involved in a research program to establish standards with our adjoining states of Kansas, Nebraska, and Iowa. The study is being conducted by Dr. Bob Smith of Kansas State University."

**Wisconsin:** "Standards should be general in nature so the states are allowed sufficient latitude to preserve and develop what is unique and special to the area rather than conform to guidelines that may not be appropriate. Standards should include:

- Limitations on development, private access, junkyard development, and outdoor advertising;
- Guidelines for preservation of ~~natural~~ scenic areas;
- Vegetation management should be based on a program for preservation and regeneration of native vegetation of the area."

Region IV:

**Alaska:** "Any standards should be limited to minimum requirements for inclusion of particular routes in a national directory of 'scenic byways.'"

**Arizona:** "Visual Quality Criteria should be established for designation of Scenic Byways. There should be recommendations made for each designation for the future protection of the natural and cultural resources associated with each route. This criteria should focus on new construction and maintenance activities."

**Colorado:** "National Standards for the implementation of a scenic byways program should be developed to serve as a guidelines for states developing their own program. Many states have existing scenic byways programs or are working now to establish a program. Guidelines for establishing a program based on the experiences in other states could be a valuable tool for states who have not yet started a scenic byways program. These guidelines could help provide some consistency between states in terms of signage, general criteria and promotional packages which could create the image of a national program without the necessary regulations a national program would need."

**Montana:** "Standards should not be dictated. It should be left up to a state to determine applicable standards within political subdivisions."

**Nevada:** "Standards should meet AASHTO minimum standards for the functional classification of the road (i.e., local roads, secondary highway, primary highway)."

**Oregon:** "We have some designation provisions that may be applicable to all states, although each state will probably have unique situations. Included with this survey, please find a copy of Oregon's program with all of our designation provisions."

**Texas:** "The standards should be related to those associated with the selection criteria for roads and minimally impact the geometric design and safety of the roadway. Some guidelines for the design of turnout or connection to overlooks or special rest areas may be needed.

"Standards for selection candidate roads should include:

1) level of private sector initiative, commitment, and support
2) tourism generated
3) national or historic significance
4) minimum geometric design standards for bridges on proposed route
5) minimum scenic and historical documentation requirements
6) state designation requirements"

**Utah:** "The diverse characteristics of our nations scenic qualities would suggest an individual, state by state, developed program where they are individually responsible for its credibility."

**Washington:** "We have some applicable to timbered and mountainous terrain. Studies are very 'site specific.'"

**Wyoming:** "The standards should pertain to the scenic and aesthetic qualities of the countryside through which the roadway passes. It should not involve standards which would prohibit new construction or rehabilitation to increase highway capacity or safety."

6. Does your member department have any problems with Congressional enactment of national scenic byways legislation?

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Region I | 7 | yes | 4 | no | | |
| Region II | 7 | yes | 4 | no | | |
| Region III | 2 | yes | 5 | no | | |
| Region IV | 10 | yes | 3 | no | | |
| Total | 26 | yes | 16 | no | 1 | unanswered |

Region I:

**District of Columbia:** "Not applicable to D.C."

**Connecticut:** "Scenic Road Programs should be developed and carried out at the State level."

**Delaware:** "Not of national significance. Should be at discretion of states (eligible but not mandatory or categorical under flexible funding)."

**Maine:** "In view of the 2020 effort, this legislation would be a duplication of effort. The money would be better spent in other areas."

**Maryland:** "Diversion of funds from other program categories."

**New Hampshire:** "The designation and promotion of scenic byways should be handled by the individual States. Each State could design a program which fits their particular needs."

**New York:** "We are concerned with the creation of a new categorical highway program when AASHTO policy calls for a reduction in categories and more flexibility by the States to use limited Federal-aid funds to meet highest priority needs."

**Pennsylvania:** "The need for federal involvement is not apparent, especially since approximately 30 states presently have their own scenic byway programs. The states should continue to have discretion over scenic byways, without federal guidelines or mandates. Also, if scenic byways were to become part of the federal-aid highway program, scarce federal resources could be spread even thinner."

Region II:

**Alabama:** "We believe we do not need another 'program' to divert our limited funds from the other urgent needs within our highway system."

**Florida:** "See cover letter."

**Georgia:** "See attachment."

**Kentucky:** "Legislation should not intend to create a new federal highway system or funding category. Intent should not be the creation of a new list of unfunded highway projects.

"It should not take authority away from the individual states to administer their highways as they deem appropriate. It also should not take funds away from our other critically deficient highway programs."

**Mississippi:** "Unless handled properly, this program like other historic, cultural and preservation programs could become a hurdle to healthy development."

**North Carolina:** "But it will depend on the flexibility of federal mandates and their support of the states' programs."

**Tennessee:** "The decision of whether or not to have a scenic highway system should be with each individual state."

**Virginia:** "This Department is concerned about federal restrictions that may be imposed for those facilities so designated and for the adjacent corridors."

Region III:

**Illinois:** "If scenic byways become a mandated Federal program, funding for byways should come from the General Revenue Funds, not the Highway Trust Fund, since scenic byways are mostly tourism or recreational in nature. In addition, scenic byways should include local highway systems."

**Iowa:** "We oppose the creation of any 'new' categorical federal funding programs. The implementation of a federal 'Scenic Byways' program runs counter to the direction that the Transportation 2020 effort should be going, namely fewer federal program categories, fewer restrictions, and more flexibility."

**Michigan:** "Providing there is appropriate funding associated with the program."

**Wisconsin:** "It should be designed to help preserve the state's heritage of native vegetation and wildlife as well as sufficient natural terrain to provide adequate habitat for their survival. This can be done by providing national support for expansion and continuation of existing scenic programs. It should not inhibit local spontaneity, innovation or enthusiasm by imposing burdensome regulations or causing relinquishment of state control."

Region IV:

**Alaska:** "We are not ready for a national program of this type! Participation in any proposed program should be voluntary, not mandatory. Another concern - how should contact and coordination with local governments take place?"

**California:** "Please see attached letter to Kermit V. Kiebert, Director, Idaho Department of Transportation."

**Colorado:** "Congressional enactment of national scenic byways legislation would create another level of rules and regulations that we feel is unnecessary. The Colorado Scenic and Historic Byways Commission is already working with the U.S. Forest Service and BLM to coordinate with their national criteria. Adding another set of national criteria could create more problems and confusion in the Commission's efforts to coordinate the designation of scenic byways in Colorado. Furthermore, national legislation could actually discourage recognition of each state's unique scenic and cultural attributes if a standardized byways program is created. Evaluation and designation of scenic byways is best left to the individual states."

**Montana:** "Such a program would tend to interfere with a state's ability to effectively deal with scenic highway issues within their own legislative process."

**Nevada:** "State Constitution prohibits the use of State Highway Funds for any purpose other than constructing or maintaining highways. Therefore, other funding sources would have to be provided to meet the requirements to protect and enhance the areas through which the byways pass. para 3(4), 3(3), 2a(4), 2a(6), 2b(2)."

**New Mexico:** "The department is concerned that a scenic byways designation could result in changes to road design or maintenance standards. The goals of the scenic byways program (such as preserving a scenic area's environment) may conflict with the department's primary responsibility to provide the best transportation system for the state with available resources. In a state like New Mexico, many existing highways are already scenic areas. No special designation or program is required. What is needed in New Mexico is adequate funding to keep the State Highway System in good condition."

**South Dakota:** "Our state would not support a federal 'Scenic Byways' program. Our concern is that another program category of funding would be established with added federal requirements and regulations. We would, however, support the promotion of state programs at a national level."

**Texas:** "Much of our current Federal-aid funds are used to rehabilitate and reconstruct our current highway system. As long as the proposed legislation does not significantly impact our current obligation authority and programs, a minor amount of obligation funding for signing the byway routes would be offset by increased revenues of tourism travel to the states, the condition would be satisfactory."

**Utah:** "We are skeptical of a new source of funding and Federal funding incentives are seldom worth the red tape. Further, the concept leans toward an added level of environmental type control for 'protection' of these routes."

**Washington:** "... if a separate federal allocation is not provided. However, since this program will ultimately get into land use issues outside highway rights of way, it would be better addressed at the state level."

7. Should the federal government provide funding for scenic byways?

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Region I | 3 | yes | 6 | no | | |
| Region II | 4 | yes | 6 | no | | |
| Region III | 6 | yes | 1 | no | | |
| Region IV | 6 | yes | 5 | no | | |
| Total | 19 | yes | 18 | no | 6 | unanswered |

Region I:

**Connecticut:** "Not knowing what the funding would actually be used for, this State cannot say if federal funding should be used."

**Delaware:** "See response to Question 6."

**District of Columbia:** "Not applicable to D.C."

**Pennsylvania:** "No, unless a federal program is established, and then funding from sources other than the Highway Trust Fund should be identified."

Region II:

**Georgia:** "See attachment."

**Kentucky:** "Yes, if legislation requires state activity."

**Mississippi:** "By allocation."

**South Carolina:** "Or provide funding on a limited basis."

**Virginia:** "Possibly (depending on what strings were attached.)"

Region III:

**Michigan:** "At a minimum, funding should be made available as stipulated in the legislation for various appurtenances. Otherwise the various states should retain responsibility for their individual programs. Also, the individual states should retain the prerogative of maintaining programs that may include broader criteria than those adopted by AASHTO."

**Wisconsin:** "If there is a program, there should be some form of funding as an incentive."

Region IV:

**Colorado:** "Local organizations wishing to designate scenic byways in Colorado will be encouraged to look for funding sources in their own area. These sources can be anything from non-profit foundations to local or state government and private citizens. The intent is to encourage partnerships that will help support the promotional activities for the scenic byways."

**Montana:** "Yes, if the program results in states being required to make capital investments on designated routes."

**Texas:** As noted in response to Question 6."

**Utah:** "If it is a new appropriation with 100% obligation authority."

**Washington:** "If mandated."

8. If you believe that the federal government should provide funding for scenic byways, what does your member department advise as to how much and from where?

Region I:

**Delaware:** "See response to Question 6."

**Massachusetts:** "Monies should come from the Highway Trust Fund. Land acquisition for scenic highways should be an eligible cost."

**New Hampshire:** "Not applicable."

**New Jersey:** "Within existing programs of roadway funding."

**New York:** "Any special categorical funding provided should not come from the Highway Trust Fund. It should be from an annual appropriation of general funds."

**Rhode Island:** "The funding should be sufficient to cover the development of rules of procedure and evaluation criteria and provide funding to the state to staff a person to do the field evaluation and present findings to the state 'Scenic Highway Board.' Implementation of such a program is not eligible for federal highway planning funds."

Region II:

**Alabama:** "Any funding should come from the General Fund as does the Appalachian Program."

**Arkansas:** "Adequate to bring system up to nationwide standards and provide necessary coordination and publicity for the system. Funding should come from traditional sources - primarily Motor Fuel Tax (Federal)."

**Georgia:** "See attachment."

**Kentucky:** "Funding should totally cover required effort, i.e., perhaps one man-year of funding."

**Louisiana:** "Should be special appropriation similar to Public Lands or Forest Highway Programs."

**Mississippi:** "Should not come out of trust funds -- perhaps a formula based on per cent of rural mileage."

**Virginia:** "A review of the reports required by the proposed legislation would be necessary prior to a determination of this."

Region III:

**Illinois:** "See response for Question 6."

**Iowa:** "If any federal funds are made available they should not come from the Federal Highway Trust Fund."

**Kansas:** "Unobligated balance in Trust Fund."

**Michigan:** "Funding for a scenic byways program should be made part of the 'flexible' portion of federal aid, thereby allowing the member states to determine the level of spending necessary to maintain their system according to the predetermined criteria."

**Minnesota:** "The federal government should provide trust fund money for a 'Scenic Byways Study.' Program implementation should be financed at a low level (less than 1% of a state's apportionment) with high (over 50%) local participation."

**Missouri:** "We believe the funds should be of an option nature that funds may be utilized in a scenic byway improvement."

**Nebraska:** "Funding should be made available from existing categories, not an additional funding category."

**Wisconsin:** "Only as suggestions:

- Funding could be similar to Highway Beautification funds;
- Scenic Byways on the federal Aid System could merit a higher percentage of matching funds;
- LAWCON funds could be used, or even EPA funds might be appropriate."

Region IV:

**Arizona:** "Funding allocations should include from 5%-10% for special design considerations for enhancement and preservation of unique features."

**Colorado:** "N/A"

**Montana:** "Funding should be sufficient to meet basic needs of designated routes. Should come from non-highway trust fund sources, i.e., special taxation or revenue raising through the recreation industry, etc."

**Nevada:** "Apportionments/allocations for F.A. Systems should be increased 10%. Funding can come from unused HTF balance which Congress won't allow states to use."

**Oregon:** "Preservation of highways within federal lands should be primarily federal funded. Highways outside federal areas could be funded on a shared basis, federal, state, local cooperation. Perhaps user fees could be collected for extremely fragile areas."

**Texas:** "Federal funding should be based on the needs for furnishing and installing byway signing along the highway system. Unallocated reserves in the Federal Highway Trust Fund should be used above current obligation authority."

**Utah:** "How much? Similar to the Forest Highway Program. From where? A new appropriation, not redistribution of existing funds (like Interstate)."

**Washington:** "100% from non-highway allocation. This state is always short of funds for roadway improvement. Roadside needs (beyond safety needs) are low priority when competing with roadway needs."

**Wyoming:** "Funding should be limited to signing and promotion. Construction funding should come from existing Federal and State sources."

9. Instead of a federal scenic byways program, does your member department have any suggestion as to ways to encourage states to have their own scenic byways programs?

Region I:

**Connecticut:** "The Connecticut Scenic Road Program was legislatively mandated."

**Delaware:** "See response to Question 6."

**Maine:** "No."

**Maryland:** "Establish AASHTO guidelines and an inventory of State practices."

**Massachusetts:** "1) States could duplicate the MDPW's Open Space Program.
2) Tax laws could be altered to help encourage landowners to donate conservation easements.
3) Grants to towns to study and implement zoning changes.
4) Develop and map statewide network of scenic roads. Coordinate with Bureaus of Tourism."

**New Hampshire:** "Issue guidelines on designation and design criteria and make scenic byways eligible for funding at the State's option under a Block Grant Program."

**New York:** "We suggest that preserving and enhancing scenic and historic qualities associated with highways, including acquisition of scenic easements, be made an eligible cost of construction under all Federal-aid programs."

**Pennsylvania:** "Incorporate in tourism development programs."

**Rhode Island:** "Suggest making it a federal initiative with funding made available for program development and implementation especially, since it cannot be charged as a planning function."

Region II:

**Alabama:** "Inasmuch as the tourism business is one of the largest businesses in each state and would benefit from this type of program, I suggest that funds come from that source--but only if an individual state is interested."

**Arkansas:** "While we favor a Federal System, Federal coordination with emphasis on economic development through increased tourism could encourage states to act on their own."

**Georgia:** "See attachment."

**Kentucky:** "Federal government should provide incentives such as larger share of Road Fund monies or either other special funding to those states who have meaningful programs."

**Mississippi:** "None."

**North Carolina:** "On-going encouragement such as that given in FHWA's 'Scenic Byways' where the states are listed as having a program or not and the extent to which the scenic byways programs have been developed."

**Tennessee:** "Tourist organizations and promotion agencies should determine if a scenic highway system would be beneficial to their state."

**Virginia:** "Education/Workshops."

Region III:

**Illinois:** "The Federal Government could encourage the development of scenic byways by allowing 100% federal funding of scenic easements and purchases under existing categorical funds. This could allow states to develop their own priorities for these facilities."

**Iowa:** "Yes, provide states with a methodology for identifying scenic routes, for ranking the best opportunities, and a methodology for involving 'others' in the evaluation and inventory process as well as advice who the 'others' should be. Federal government could sponsor research into non-economic means to protect the view from the road (scenic preservation), but not mandate spending highway money for such purposes. Research could also be done into the economic impacts of scenic highway designations and controls on local economies and individual property owners."

**Michigan:** "The Scenic Byways conference held in 1988 was very successful in raising the consciousness of various agencies as to the potential value of having a scenic byways program. Continued efforts of this nature, such as the November 1989 conference, the Byways Bulletin, and various success stories from states having scenic programs can do much toward establishing byways nationwide."

**Nebraska:** "Nebraska is involved in a study of this subject with Iowa, Kansas and Missouri to determine whether and how to establish a Scenic Byway System."

**Wisconsin:** "Inform states of the beneficial aspects of the program, especially preservation of a part of their heritage inherent in scenic beauty and natural areas. Other encouragement can be gained from:

- Increased tourism revenues;
- Using Byways as a means of removing traffic from major highways;
- Using Byways as a means of bringing tourists to remote, less populated areas for financial growth as well as the enjoyment of the traveler."

Region IV:

**Alaska:** "Make federal funds available solely for the purpose of planning a state program addressing scenic byways. Our state would require at least $150,000 annually."

**Arizona:** "Using model legislation - pass state legislation to define, establish and protect scenic byways."

**California:** "Development of a model process for the designation of official state scenic highways."

**Colorado:** "Providing guidance to states without programs by sharing criteria, policies and procedures, signage examples and promotional packages would be most valuable. It would also be important to share information about the advantages and disadvantages of scenic byway designation in terms of increased tourism benefits, increased traffic, safety needs, etc.

"As drafted, S. 432 goes well beyond providing a useful set of guidelines for each state's consideration in managing or developing a Scenic Byways program. Throughout Section 2 (Findings, Purpose and Policy) there is language which suggests creation of a new set of federal regulations to govern highway development and improvement in designated 'scenic byways.' Statements which underscore our concern appear in Section 2, paragraphs (a)(3), (a)(4), (a)(6), (b)(2) and (c) and go well beyond the reasonable and potentially valuable information to be gathered under the Scenic Byways Plan described in Section 3.

"Tourism appears to be an important part of economic development and many states recognize the need to market their state's attractions and scenic beauty. In time, all states will realize this and work to implement a scenic byways program on their own."

**Montana:** "No comment except: a scenic highway program and standards should be by a state's choosing, not the federal government."

**Nevada:** "None."

**New Mexico:** "Most, if not all, states already know that it is economically advantageous to support tourism. In New Mexico, the Economic Development and Tourism Department works with the Highway and Transportation Department in the development and distribution of materials that acquaint residents and visitors with the scenic areas of the state and highways that serve these areas."

**Oregon:** "Oregon had legislators, interested public and private historians and conservationists that drafted the bills to establish our existing program."

**South Dakota:** "Encourage states to develop their own scenic byways programs. Encouragement to states could be given through national recognition and promotion."

**Texas:** "Yes. Consistent with our response to answers for questions 5, 6 and 8, we should believe the Federal government responsibility to fund byway should be limited to the identification of needs, i.e. plans, signing, and scenic byway road improvements. The states' responsibility would be to promote the identification of potential byway routes and install signing for byways. In addition, the bill could include provisions for the private sector sponsoring through possibly tax exemption incentives to research and provide historical, scenic, and cultural information and materials (i.e. maps, guides, audio/video tapes, etc.) and, provide outside the highway right of way scenic, recreational and historic attractions as needed, associated with each byway approved in the Federal plan. Since the private sector would greatly benefit from increased tourism, costs for roadside amenities, marketing programs, information systems, traveler services, and scenic easements should be born by sponsoring public sector institutions. After the commitment of the private sector institutions and approval in the Federal plan, the States would designate and maintain scenic byway signing. Possibly some roadways and bridges will need to be brought to current geometric design standards if increased traffic is projected. Furthermore, unallocated reserves in the Federal Highway Trust Fund should be used for these type road improvements.

"In states such as Texas, where population growth and travel demand is steadily increasing, no policy should be developed to inhibit the expansion or increase the difficulty in upgrading these secondary roads for safety and capacity reasons."

**Utah:** "Coordination with and encouragement from the Travel Industry was adequate for our program."

**Washington:** "Again, funding would be a key inducement."

**Wyoming:** "No suggestions at this time."

**American Recreation Coalition**
*Dedicated to the protection and enhancement of every citizen's right to pursue health and happiness through leisure-time activities.*

June 8, 1989

The Honorable Patrick Moynihan
Chairman
Subcommittee on Water Resources, Transportation
and Infrastructure
Committee on Environment and Public Works
United States Senate
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Senator Moynihan:

We are pleased to write and express our enthusiastic support for S.432, the Scenic Byways Study Act of 1989, and ask that the enclosed testimony be included in the record of your June 9 hearing on that legislation.

During my service on the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors, I saw evidence of both the need for and the broad enthusiasm surrounding a national scenic byway program. Just as roads link people and places, the scenic byway program can link conservation, recreation, tourism, and highway interests. It is an exciting prospect.

We urge prompt and positive action on the measure.

Sincerely,

Derrick A. Crandall
President

DAC/epw
Enclosure

Suite 726 • 1331 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W. • Washington, D.C. 20004 • (202) 662-7420

# TESTIMONY BY DERRICK A. CRANDALL, PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN RECREATION COALITION, BEFORE THE WATER RESOURCES, TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE, UNITED STATES SENATE REGARDING S.432, THE SCENIC BYWAYS STUDY ACT OF 1989, ON JUNE 9, 1989.

---

I am pleased to share my views with this committee from two perspectives. From 1985 to 1987, I had the tremendous opportunity to serve as a member of the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors. Through more than twenty meetings of this commission across the nation and through a national survey of recreation activities done for the commission, I learned first-hand about the special role recreation plays in the lives of individual Americans, their families and their communities. We also learned much about the travel which results from the quest of Americans for quality experiences outdoors.

I also serve as the President of the non-profit federation of the nation's leading private sector recreation interests, called the American Recreation Coalition. Our members range from nationally known companies such as Coleman, Disney and Huffy to associations of recreation opportunity providers, including campgrounds and rafting companies, to individual membership groups, such as the Good Sam Club, the United States Recreational Ski Association and the American Motorcyclist Association.

Let me begin by stating that more Americans are doing more things outdoors today more often than ever before. The President's Commission found that we were spending in excess of $300 billion annually in the process. We buy bicycles and boats, RV's and skis; we pay for fishing guides and rafting trips, for admission into our national parks and onto ski slopes operated by private companies on national forests. Our recreation expenditures have been climbing faster than overall GNP growth for two decades, and we see no reason to expect that trend to change.

How we spend our leisure time and dollars has changed. Participation in adventure sports has soared and will remain strong, partly because we need a counterpoint to our increasingly urban, sedentary daily routines. Linear corridors have taken on great importance; trails for bicycling, snowmobiling and hiking, rivers to raft and canoe, scenic highways to drive. Cold weather activities are much more popular, as clothing and other equipment tempers the discomfort of freezing temperatures.

Mechanized and motorized devices facilitate access to the outdoors for the elderly and the mobility-impaired. Electronic advances originating with the military now help us find fish and navigate our recreational watercraft. We can safely predict that similar technology transfers will soon let us ski and play golf at night without lights, and will permit us to journey underwater in mini-subs and near-fool-proof scuba equipment.

I would like to submit for the record a more in-depth review of likely recreation trends which first appeared in American Forests magazine last year.

Essentially, we know that the quest for quality outdoor experiences remains strong among Americans. And we know that interest in the American outdoors is growing rapidly abroad. No other nation in the world can surpass the physical diversity and recreational facilities found in the United States. Those assets are beginning to pay off in the international tourism field. Our parks and rivers and mountains and wildlife draw back those who have already seen our cities. Studies by the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration and our own anecdotal experiences offer proof that more and more visitors to America want to rent cars and RVs or board tour buses to explore the immense area between our coasts.

What they will find is an array of public and private recreation providers offering tremendous value and quality. available for advance reservations through a single "800" number, and Mistix, the new Forest Service partner, hopes to expand this service to provide reservations for private recreation opportunities and recreation information, as well.

One way to help bring together those hungry for recreation and those anxious to provide recreation opportunities is through the scenic byway concept.

Americans have long enjoyed the chance to see the diversity of this great nation. Scenic drives into the country and longer distance explorations were principal initial uses of the automobile. Early in this century, state and federal agencies developed specific routes for recreational drivers. New York and Oregon were early leaders in constructing parkways and scenic drives, followed closely by Texas, Vermont and other states. Federal efforts began in earnest during the 1930s and focused in and around the nation's capital and within the national park system. The success of these initiatives is clear today. The corridors containing these scenic byways today attract millions of visitors annually, and their natural beauty remains protected.

Calls for a national scenic highway system were heard in the 1960's. The first federal survey of recreational activities was conducted in 1960 and placed pleasure driving at the top of our leisure activities, where it has remained in each of the subsequent national Recreation Surveys. In fact, a feasibility study was undertaken by the Department of Transportation in 1973 for a national system of scenic highways and parkways. The first of our nation's energy emergencies prompted a report which validated the need for attention to scenic byways but which recommended against a new initiative.

While federal efforts remained on hold, state progress continued. More than half of the states developed some type of program; some were quite ambitious. Key private initiatives such as the designation program of the American Automobile Association were begun. And the volume of recreational travel continued to climb to the current level of nearly 20% of all vehicle miles.

By the time of the President's Commission, both a need and a window of opportunity were apparent. After thirty years of focused public investment, the nation had developed an outstanding interstate highway system to move people and goods swiftly and safely between our urban centers. We had also developed major public park and recreation programs, expanding opportunities to enjoy fishing and boating, swimming and golfing, camping and team sports. Yet an activity at the very top of the list in recreational popularity -- pleasure driving -- attracted little attention from either effort. The timing was right for a new scenic byways push because a major effort to craft a new, long-range blueprint for our nation's highway program, the Transportation 2020 initiative, was already underway.

The President's Commission urged federal, state, local and private efforts to identify, publicize, protect and enhance recreational driving experiences through scenic byways. Few of our other recommendations sparked as rapid and positive responses. Wonderful progress has already been made. New dialogue is occurring among transportation, recreation, tourism, environmental and cultural community leaders, and all believe that we can craft a national scenic byway program which accomplishes our respective goals.

A national scenic byway program can be justified simply on the grounds of the great demand for driving through scenic areas. Touring these areas is, after all, the second most popular leisure activity. Its popularity has not been shaken by energy emergencies or changes in our family patterns, nor by technological advances in home entertainment nor neglect of this demand by recreation and transportation planners for several decades. But scenic byways offer more.

A linear corridor running through a region binds together the communities, the businesses and the people it links. This connection can build regional pride and identity and surely facilitates the kind of cooperation needed to market the region's recreational and cultural offerings. It can become the kind of tool small towns and disadvantaged cities need to diversify their economies.

Creating scenic byways does not necessitate new road construction. In most cases, the roads, the scenery, the attractions and the services are already in place. The byway might follow the paths of early settlers or explorers, like the Nachez Trace or the Lewis and Clark Trail, or feature areas famous for white-water rafting or skiing. Many communities have the potential for scenic byway development.

Scenic byways forge partnerships. We see that along existing scenic byways, such as the Blue Ridge Parkway and the Great River Road. State highway agencies, federal land managers, local governments and local tourism and recreation interests become involved in the management of the corridor. We've seen that scenic byway programs stimulate partnerships. We are very excited by the partnership between the Forest Service and Plymouth, a partnership which will have direct, on-the-ground benefits here in West Virginia and across the nation. We are excited that other companies are becoming involved with this partnership, and that the Bureau of Land Management is in the discussion stage with still other companies regarding a partnership in their backcountry byway program.

Scenic byway designations can unlock the tourism potential of rural areas and generate much-needed revenue. The economic benefits of scenic byways can be substantial. Tennessee officials estimated that if scenic byways kept only one percent of Tennessee's visitors in the state for an extra half day, annual tourism revenues would increase by six million dollars. Rural businesses ranging from campgrounds to gas stations to restaurants, inns and craft shops can all benefit from proper designation, protection and marketing of scenic byways. The potential for breathing new life in to depressed economies through tourism generated by scenic and historic roads is indeed great.

We're also excited by the potential scenic byways have for linking Americans to the wide variety of recreational opportunities in this nation. Roads which lead to our parks and forests and allow people to enjoy hiking, bicycling, fishing, and other outdoor activities are especially needed near our towns and cities.

Scenic byways should be a part of the nation's post-interstate highway construction program. We need to take action soon to ensure the special scenic, cultural, recreational and historic roads of this nation are identified. We need to provide more tools for states and local communities anxious to enhance and protect scenic and recreational corridors.

Mr. Chairman, we believe that the legislation before you, S.432, the Scenic Byway Study Act of 1989, is a terribly important step forward in realizing the special promise of the scenic byway idea, and that it will have long-lasting benefits for our nation by adding and coordinating recreation and tourism opportunities.

Thank you.

Derrick A. Crandall, President
American Recreation Coalition
1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Suite 726
Washington, D.C.  20004
(202)662-7420

# Responses to Questions of Senator Symms Regarding Scenic Byways

By

Derrick A. Crandall, President
American Recreation Coalition

1. *What in your view constitutes a scenic highway?*

A scenic highway is a roadway which (1) passes through a region of significant natural and cultural beauty and (2) has appropriate improvements, such as signage and amenity facilities, to enhance the experiences of those traveling the route for recreational purposes.

2. *Are there things, short of a Federal program for scenic byways, that the Federal government could do to encourage scenic byways at the State and local level?*

The American Recreation Coalition does not envision or support a federal scenic byways program where management of the roadways now under state and local jurisdictions would become federal routes. Rather, we envision federal efforts to aid a national scenic byways program which would be state- and local-focused. In short, we see federal efforts to be primarily technical assistance and stimulative. We do strongly support scenic byway programs by federal land-managing agencies on and through lands they are charged with administering. The National Forest Scenic Byways program and the Bureau of Land Management's Backcountry Byways programs, for example, are exciting initiatives which have our full support and endorsement, as well as the enthusiastic support of the President.

We also support coordination of state, local and federal agency scenic byway programs on such matters as design, signage, information and management. This is a legitimate and viable goal for a national scenic byways program.

3. *What do you see as the advantages in having a Federal scenic byway program rather than a state program? Are there any disadvantages? Are there things which could be accomplished in a Federal scenic byways program that the States cannot accomplish themselves?*

Again, we do not support a federal scenic byways program operated by the Department of Transportation. We support a national scenic byways program based upon the scenic byways efforts of states, local jurisdictions and land-managing federal agencies. We see significant advantages to such a national program over the current pattern of uncoordinated efforts. First, travellers will be more likely to seek out and use scenic byways, since overall awareness of the byways will increase. Second, some consistency in signing will aid that same traveller. Third, research on recreational driving patterns, on scenic highway design and management and more can be shared effectively and efficiently. Fourth, the combined efforts of the states, local communities and federal agencies on scenic byways will give focus to important rural highway needs, counterbalancing the very visible urban roadway needs of the nation.

**Responses to Questions of Senator Symms - 2**

4. *S. 432 directs the Department of Transportation to conduct a study of certain scenic byways issues. Is there anything else that should be included in this study?*

We believe the current language will produce a useful report and will help to guide Congress' action on the 1991 highway bill. We would welcome information from the study process regarding management practices which enhance scenic driving opportunities without imposing undesirable constraints on other traffic and on community growth.

5. *What kind of traffic should be permitted on a scenic byway? For example, what effect will a scenic byways designation have on truck traffic, the trucking industry and other industries dependent on truck transportation?*

ARC does not equate scenic byways with parkways. In most instances, we do not envision restrictions on vehicle types travelling on scenic byways beyond those dictated by infrastructure such as bridges and road design. Going to the Sun Highway in Glacier National Park, for example, restricts vehicles above a certain length based upon roadway curve radius and land width. In fact, we believe a key element of each scenic byway program -- state, local or federal agency -- should be to identify the current and anticipated mix of traffic and design improvements which will reduce conflicts among different users. Design features which can be useful in this effort include climbing lanes, passing lanes, off-road parking at scenic spots and widened shoulders.

At the same time, ARC believes that scenic byways can be used to reduce competition between through-traffic, including trucks, and recreational drivers. Recreational drivers can be lured off interstates and primary routes to parallel, lesser travelled routes where through truck traffic is unlikely.

6. *S. 432 authorizes $1 million to do the scenic byways study. Is this amount too little, too much or the right amount?*

We believe that, in light of materials already available to the department, the requested funding is adequate to produce the requested report.

7. *Should roads which are not on the Federal-aid highway system be included in a Federal scenic byways system? Should such off-system roads be eligible for Federal funds?*

Yes and yes. Among the examples of roads not on the Federal-aid system which should be included in a national scenic byways program are Forest Development Highways in the national forests and comparable BLM roads. We would also not oppose eligibility for limited funding for improvements along some locally-maintained roads not now in the system.

8. *If a Federal scenic byway program of designation is created, what kind of design standards, land use standards and aesthetic standards should be required?*
The national scenic byway system we envision would defer most design and management standards to state and local agencies. Scenic byway programs of the states should not be identical, all cut from the same cookie cutter. Important differences exist in the geography and the culture of our nation, region to region. Instead, the national program should depend upon voluntary participation by each state and should require only certain minimum program standards. For example, each state program probably should include:

- clear criteria for designation of a route as a scenic byway;
- a signage policy;
- a method for monitoring change in a designated road, so that continued eligibility for inclusion is checked;
- a provision for providing technical assistance to local communities along scenic byways to assist them in coordinating growth and scenic byway protection.

9. *Because the States and localities own all highways, are there any liability concerns with a Federal scenic byway program?*
We envision designations to be made by state and local jurisdictions. Numerous states have been designating routes as scenic for years and liability problems have not emerged.

10. *What amount of funds, if any, from the Highway Trust Fund or general revenues should be made available for a Federal scenic byways program? Because of the deficit situation, there is a limited amount of money available and any program increases or funding for new programs generally means that an off-setting cut must be made somewhere else in the program. Are there other areas in the highway program that can be reduced to increase funding for scenic byways?*
We do not advocate specific levels of funding for the national scenic byways program. Funding needs for this program should be considered in light of the proposed study and during consideration of other national highway needs as the 1991 highway bill is prepared. On the other hand, the Highway Trust Fund was established as a means to levy user fees on highway users and to return those fees to serve those paying the fees. Recreational driving constitutes some 20% of all vehicular miles today, and a substantial portion of this driving occurs on roads suitable for designation as scenic byways. We therefore strongly believe an investment of Highway Trust Fund monies in a scenic byways program at some level is justified.

We might note that while the need for and advisability of a categorical grant program for scenic byways is not certain at this point, it is certain that scenic byway projects -- including appropriate amenities such as pull-offs at scenic spots and rest areas -- should be made fully eligible for funding under Federal-aid guidelines.

Finally, we believe that the 1991 highway bill should look at all of the nation's highway needs and recommend an allocation of available resources, regardless of historic funding levels. One major federal program -- Federal aid for new interstate highway construction -- is unlikely to be a component of this measure, suggesting that opportunities exist for funding important new initiatives such as scenic byways.

11. *Where should a scenic byways system rank in Federal priorities compared to the Interstate system, bridges or other Federal-aid categories?*

In light of the high volume of recreational travel in cars and RV's, trucks and motorcycles, buses and more, we believe that scenic byways should be a national priority. It is important to recognize that scenic byways will be heavily concentrated in the nation's rural areas, many of which continue to suffer from economic dislocations in the natural resources and agricultural communities. Scenic byways can and should be seen as a viable public policy to diversify and strengthen rural economies. Rather than a government-based redistribution of income, scenic byways spur tourism which allows the marketplace to cycle dollars to the nation's rural communities.

12. *What kind of design standards should be required to maintain a highway's scenic character and yet provide safe transportation if the number of highway users are increased by attracting large numbers of tourists?*

Fame comes at a price. A successful scenic byways program will increase traffic and spark development along its corridor. These changes can jeopardize the very character which prompted initial designation. Local land use planning is the principal mechanism available to guide growth, and each state scenic byway program should encourage and assist local communities to plan for growth and increased visitation.

We feel strongly that increased usage should not mean increased dangers to those using the roadway. Needed highway features, such as passing lanes, left turn lanes, signs and roadside restraints, should be built. At the same time, we would hope that most of the nation's scenic roads would not be travelled at the same rates of speed as the interstates. Ingress and egress will not be nearly as controlled on scenic routes, and we hope that people will take advantage of the sights along the road corridors.

Highway Users Federation
FOR SAFETY AND MOBILITY

# STATEMENT FOR THE RECORD

of the

Water Resources, Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee

Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works

on S. 432
The Scenic Byways Study Act of 1989

Hearing Date: June 9, 1989

1776 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036-1993 (202) 857-1200

Statement for the Record
Submitted to Water Resources, Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee, Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works
The Scenic Byways Study Act of 1989, S. 432
Hearing Date: June 9, 1989

The Highway Users Federation appreciates this opportunity to offer comments on S. 432, the Scenic Byways Study Act of 1989.

We support this legislation and urge your prompt and favorable action so that study results will be available to you and other members of Congress as you reshape the nation's surface transportation legislation in the sessions immediately ahead.

The Highway Users Federation is a national coalition of businesses, industries and associations working to improve the safety and efficiency of America's highway transportation system. Our membership consists of more than 400 companies and associations representing 27 industrial and commercial categories, 63 state and local conferences and over 2000 individual members. Our members in turn represent over 30 million commercial and private users of the nation's highway system.

Our members are primarily business entities who know that a high quality highway system is essential to business and industrial activities and to our ability to stay competitive in international markets.

But we know that our highway system is more than that; highways are the principal way Americans enjoy America. On an average day, 300,000 Americans begin a vacation trip of at least 75 miles, 85 percent by highway. Another 125,000 start on a 75 mile or longer expedition simply to "go for a drive": to enjoy the wonders that America offers. Even larger numbers take shorter vacation or pleasure trips and, of course, many more enjoy scenic roadways during business and personal trips. /1

In total, about 17 percent of all personal vehicle miles are driven for scenic and recreational purposes./2 This is an important component of highway use. Certainly it contributes its fair share to highway revenues; but it contributes other economic benefits, as well. Tourism is one of the three top industries in 40 states. It is a particularly important economic contributor to many rural areas and a growing component of our international economic balance as well.

The Federation believes that S. 432 will help us to better understand this specific and legitimate highway need and better serve it in future highway programs. Scenic driving opportunities have been investigated on a national scale in years past and several states have outstanding current efforts; but past inventories need updating and the best parts of current efforts should be catalogued and made available to all states and interested local governments. The proposed study would be a significant contribution to sound highway legislation in the years immediately ahead.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Notes:

/1 Trip estimates expanded from Nationwide Personal Transportation Study, U.S. Bureau of Census, 1983.

/2 "Scenic Byways", Federal Highway Administration, July, 1988.

Highway
Users Federation
FOR SAFETY AND MOBILITY

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

July 7, 1989

The Honorable Steve Symms
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Water Resources,
Transportation, and Infrastructure
Committee on Environment and Public Works
United States Senate
Washington, D. C. 20510-6175

Dear Senator Symms:

In response to your letter of June 29, we are pleased to augment our earlier statement in support of S. 432, The Scenic Byways Study Act of 1989.

Responses to your questions are enclosed.

We hope these comments are helpful to the deliberations of your Committee. Our overall reaction to your questions is that the study authorized in S. 432 can be of great importance to Congress in resolving these and other concerns. The Federation urges favorable and prompt action on S. 432.

Sincerely,

Lester P. Lamm

Enclosure

Question 1. What in your view constitutes a scenic highway?

Answer: We anticipate that the study authorized in S. 432 would provide criteria for designating scenic highways, based on the experience of the several states and Federal agencies with active scenic road programs. In our view, a scenic highway is one which offers its users an outstanding opportunity to enjoy scenic, historic or cultural attributes of the area being traversed.

Question 2. Are there things, short of a Federal program for scenic byways, that the Federal government could do to encourage scenic byways at the state and local level?

Answer: The Federal Highway Administration and other Federal agencies have assisted the present development of scenic highway programs. The FHWA publication "Scenic Byways" is a case in point. We believe that such activities are, in fact, "a Federal program for scenic byways." The study authorized by S. 432 would determine whether added Federal activity would enhance this already apparent Federal interest.

Question 3. What do you see as the advantages in having a Federal scenic byway program rather than a state program? Are there any disadvantages? Are there things which could be accomplished in a Federal scenic byways program that the States cannot accomplish themselves?

Answer: The Federation is a strong advocate of the Federal-state-local partnership approach to highway activities. We would envision a Federal Scenic Highways program which would encourage and assist state and local governments in implementing scenic highway programs; thus, we do not see a dichotomy of a Federal program vs. a state program.

We cannot prejudge the results of the study authorized in S. 432, but would support a Federal Scenic Highway program which would provide technical and administrative assistance to state and local governments in planning and implementing programs; provide a means of coordinating programs among adjacent states and among state, local and Federal road management agencies; provide uniform means to and assist in advising the motoring public of scenic driving opportunities; and, as appropriate, provide matching funds for safety and other improvements to enhance user benefits.

We believe that such Federal involvement would be an improvement over the 50 states and various Federal agencies acting independently, as is the current situation.

Question 4. S. 432 directs the Department of Transportation to conduct a study of certain scenic byway issues. Is there anything else that should be included in this study?

Answer: The bill language is sufficiently broad, we believe, to permit the Department to develop an appropriate study within the time and financial constraints involved. We would expect that much of the study effort would be directed to compiling the experience and knowledge of the various state and Federal agencies which have active scenic road programs.

We are conscious that the purpose of S. 432 is to provide Congress with such a compilation of experience and expertise in time to be useful in determining elements of the future Federal-aid highway program.

Question 5. What kind of traffic should be permitted on a scenic byway? For example, what effect will a scenic byways designation have on truck traffic, the trucking industry and other industries dependent on truck transportation?

Answer: Most roads serve more than one purpose. We believe that the study authorized in S. 432 will assist in answering the important question you raise of possible competition between recreational and scenic driving desires of the motoring public (which constitute some 20 percent of all highway traffic) and the equally vital commercial and non-scenic uses. In the typical case, we believe that the study will show that appropriate highway design features will permit all uses to occur safely and with minimum interference of one with the other. The proposed study may point out ways that Federal involvement and financial assistance will help assure that such safe joint use can take place.

Question 6. S. 432 authorizes $1-million to do the scenic byways study. Is this amount too little, too much, or the right amount?

Answer: In view of the time constraint of the need to have the study results before Congress determines details of the Federal-aid highway program reauthorization, the amount seems in the appropriate range. The Department could better advise on the specific amount.

Question 7: Should roads which are not on the Federal-aid highway system be included in a Federal scenic byways system? Should such off-system roads be eligible for Federal funds?

Answer: The study authorized in S. 432 will help to answer this important question. In view of the possibility that the future Federal-aid highway program will make significant changes in system eligibilities, it seems important that Congress have information on the potential costs and benefits of making scenic road development eligible for Federal assistance.

Question 8. If a Federal scenic byway program or designation is created, what kind of design standards, land use standards, and aesthetic standards should be required?

Answer: The traditional approach to developing design and other standards on Federal-aid highway projects is a cooperative one among Federal, state, and local governments. We would support such an approach in this instance. In general, the Federation supports local determination of land use standards, but believes that there must be greater coordination between land use and highway development policies in the future than has occured in the past.

Question 9. Because the States and localities own all highways, are there any liability concerns with a Federal scenic byways program?

Answer: The Federation's concept of a Federal scenic highways program is one of Federal assistance to state and local initiatives. We are not aware of any unique liabilities which would occur, but agree that such potential should be investigated in the study authorized by S. 432 so that Congress may be aware of any potential problems when scenic highway needs are considered as part of the Federal-aid highway program reauthorization.

Question 10. What amount of Federal funds, if any, from the Highway Trust Fund or general revenues should be made available for a Federal scenic byways program? Because of the deficit situation, there is a limited amount of money available and any program increases or funding for new programs generally means that an offsetting cut must be made somewhere else in the program. Are there other areas in the highway program that can be reduced to increase funding for scenic byways?

Answer: In the near future, Congress will be considering a restructuring of the Federal-aid highway program to meet future national needs. Recreational and scenic uses of the highway system are, in our judgement, major and legitimate areas of such future need which deserve serious consideration. The study authorized in S. 432 will provide Congress with information essential to dimension this need and the economic benefits which could be associated with an effective scenic highway program. The scenic highway effort might well be an eligible use for all regular Federal-aid funds, rather than a specific program with categorical funds. This would obviate the need for offsetting cuts in other program areas.

Question 11. Where should a scenic byways system rank in Federal priorities compared to the Interstate System, bridges or other Federal-aid categories?

Answer: The study authorized in S. 432 will provide information which Congress may use in determining the relative priority of scenic and recreational uses of the highway system and the significant economic benefits associated with these uses. It is the Federation's position that the future Federal-aid highway program should recognize valid scenic and recreational needs along with the needs for urban mobility, efficient commerce and other demands on the system.

Question 12. What kind of design standards should be required to maintain a highway's scenic character and yet provide safe transportation if the number of highway users are increased by attracting large numbers of tourists?

Answer: Safety is a primary consideration in all highway development decisions. Sensitive design can, in most cases, provide for public safety as well as scenic qualities. Where one must be subordinated to the other, the Federation believes that public safety must have priority.

**LEAGUE OF AMERICAN WHEELMEN**
SUITE 209, 6707 WHITESTONE ROAD, BALTIMORE, MD 21207 (301) 944-3399

## TESTIMONY OF THE LEAGUE OF AMERICAN WHEELMEN

## TO THE SENATE ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

## SUB-COMMITTEE ON WATER RESOURCES, TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

## S. 432 THE SCENIC BYWAYS STUDY ACT OF 1989

The League of American Wheelmen is the national organization of bicyclists founded in 1880 to advance and defend the rights and interests of bicyclists. We have 18,000 members nationwide, and 500 affiliated clubs with a total membership of 160,000 regular cyclists.

The total number of bicyclists in the U.S. is estimated to be around 88 million:

- more new bikes are sold each year (12 million in 1987) than new cars
- the Gallup Organization found in December 1988 that 52% of all adults (18 and over) had ridden a bicycle within the last 12 months
- The President's Commission on American's Outdoors reported that 46% of American's bicycle for recreation.

Many of these cyclists are already frequent users of America's scenic backroads and rural byways -- enjoying the low traffic volumes, unspoiled countryside and peace and quiet these roads offer. They do not want to have those qualities destroyed.

At the same time, the enjoyment of bicycling can be greatly enhanced by directing cyclists onto these backroads, and providing services for them along the way. Abandoned railroad corridors that have been converted into bicycle trails have shown the demand for such facilities and also indicated the value to local economies of encouraging cyclists to visit.

The Scenic Byways Study Act sets up a study that can resolve the problems that competing demands can sometimes create. For example, more signing of routes may mean heavier use by motor vehicles, which may lead to greater pressure for space on the road and calls for inappropriate services such as drive-thru's with gaudy neon lighting. But, it may make the routes more accessible to cyclists -- although there may be ways to achieve this without attracting unwanted traffic and development.

It is also important for the study to emphasize that the primary use of these roads is for recreation - not transportation. The study must, therefore, consider such issues as speed limits on scenic byways and other disincentives to the use of these roads as transportation corridors.

This suggests that preservation rather than development of these roads is our major concern. We believe this approach will not create a large financial burden on federal or state and local funds as major new construction projects will not be necessary. Much of the "improvement" of these routes can be done through zoning, directional signing, maintenance and other low-cost measures.

It is important for us to stress that we do not expect the provision of parallel trails or separate paths for bicyclists, especially if this were to mean the exclusion of bicyclists from the roadway. Our hope is that well maintained roads will accommodate all potential road users in safety. Low speed limits and clear indications that routes are not for transportation will help achieve this goal.

This approach would, we hope, be borne out by the Study. At a cost of around $1 million the study should be seen as a cost effective way of preventing the development of an unnecessary, unwanted and costly construction program that might divert transportation funds from other uses -- such as maintenance, construction of highways and transit.

We recognize that scenic byways is a concept gaining in popularity and interest. We wish to see that any federally guided program is appropriate to enhance enjoyment of America's great natural heritage, rather than build over it. The proposed study can perform that task.

To summarize, we support the legislation and are anxious for the study to begin. The issues need to be resolved quickly if there is to be any chance of incorporating the findings into the 1991 Highway Act.

We believe bicyclists have a very real and direct interest in the study and any future scenic byways program. For that reason we have initiated our own survey of bicyclists to find out how existing scenic byways accommodate cycling and hope to be able to incorporate the results into a DOT study.

We urge you to support this legislation, unamended.

John Cornelison
Executive Director

June 5, 1989

Travel and Tourism
Government Affairs
Council

Two Lafayette Centre
1133 21st Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
202-293-5407
Telex 248799
Fax 202-293-3155

July 6, 1989

Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan
Chairman, Subcommittee on Water Resources,
Transportation and Infrastructure
Committee on Environment and Public Works
464 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Senator Moynihan:

The Travel and Tourism Government Affairs Council respectfully requests that these remarks be made part of the official record of the consideration by the Subcommittee on Water Resources, Transportation and Infrastructure of S. 432, "The National Scenic Byways Act".

The Council is a coalition of 31 national organizations with a strong interest in travel and tourism in the United States and internationally. As a coalition of diverse segments representing the travel industry on government issues of common concern, the Council includes representatives from transportation, accommodations, food service, travel agents, tour sales, recreation and attractions, as well as state and local travel and tourism officials.

As introduced, S. 432 proposes a national scenic byways study which would suggest possible program guidelines and designation criteria, and study the economic impact of scenic byways. We applaud you, Senator Moynihan, for being one of the original cosponsors of this legislation and for recognizing the importance of scenic byways.

With over 158 million licensed drivers, America is a nation made up of automobile owners and drivers. We are a mobile nation. We drive for work and we also drive for pleasure. And we are a nation becoming increasingly more dependent on automobiles, as demonstrated by the fact that driving increased by four percent during the last year alone with total travel accounting for approximately 10,500 miles-per-vehicle a year.

What makes scenic byways so important to the United States, and to the travel and tourism

Air Transport Association
American Automobile Association
American Bus Association
American Car Rental Association
American Council of Highway Advertisers
American Hotel and Motel Association
American Recreation Coalition
American Sightseeing International
American Ski Federation
American Society of Travel Agents
Association of Rental Travel Agents
Conference of National Park Concessioners
Gray Line Sight-Seeing Association
Highway Users Federation
Hotel Sales and Marketing Association International
International Association of Amusement Parks & Attractions
International Association of Convention & Visitor Bureaus
National Air Carrier Association
National Campground Owners Association
National Caves Association
National Council of Area and Regional Travel Organizations
National Council of State Travel Directors
National Council of Travel Attractions
National Restaurant Association
National Ski Areas Association
National Tour Association
Recreation Vehicle Industry Association
Society of American Travel Writers
Travel Industry Association of America
United States Tour Operators Association
United States Travel Data Center

At Large Members

Richard T. Ashman
Vice-President, Government & Industry Relations, Holiday Inns, Inc

Dale R. Finley
President
Convention and Visitors Bureau of Greater Cleveland

Charles Gillett
Immediate Past President and Consultant
New York Convention & Visitors Bureau

Howard P. James, Chairman
Global Hospitality Corp.

Robert E. Juliano, Legislative Representative, Hotel Employees and Restaurant Employees International Union

James Montgomery
Senior Advisor Office of the Chairman
Pan American World Airways, Inc

Richard H. Moose
Senior Vice President
American Express Company

William S. Norman
Executive Vice President
Amtrak

Martin R. Shugrue, Jr
Former President
Continental Air Lines, Inc

Preston Robert Tisch, President
Loews Corporation

Executive Director
Aubrey C. King, CAE

An Affiliate of
Travel Industry Association of America

industry? Eighty percent of all domestic travel is by automobile or motorcoach, and travelers drive over 300 billion miles for social and recreational purposes each year. Over 43 percent of Americans drive for pleasure--only walking is more popular. And scenic byways are not just for Americans--almost 40 percent of all foreign travelers who visit the United States use rental cars while over 60 percent of Canadian tourists came to the U.S. by automobile.

The concept of scenic byways began in the early 1900's as America became an increasingly mobile nation. In Westchester County, New York, four scenic byways built between 1913 and 1930 received recognition for attention to driver enjoyment of scenery. These parkways, Bronx River, Hutchinson River, Saw Mill River and Cross Country, served as models for many scenic byways which followed.

Scenic byways first became an issue of national prominence in the 1960's when recreational driving was recognized as a leading leisure activity. Scenic byways efforts in the 1960's were enhanced in large part by the highway beautification movement and particularly by the devotion of Lady Bird Johnson.

The Department of Transportation conducted a study in 1973 on the feasibility of a national system of scenic byways and parkways. More recently, in 1987, The Report of the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors recommended that a national network of scenic byways be created. In addition to these federal efforts, more than half of the states have developed some sort of scenic byways program.

We believe it is now timely and appropriate to update these earlier studies, to assess the scope and impact of scenic byways already in popular use, and to identify how the country can be best served by scenic byways in the future.

In creating a system of scenic byways across the country, the efficiency, safety and appearance of our highway system will improve. Scenic byways also preserve and promote scenic and historic corridors. Through attention to landscaping, ecological stabilization, and access control, these important corridors will be enhanced and made more appealing.

Not only do scenic byways unify America's tourism destinations, they also represent an important and invaluable attraction in and of themselves. Efforts to identify and promote scenic byways serve the interests of all motorists while a national network of scenic byways will offer economic benefits and opportunity to communities across our country. One of the major benefits of this legislation will be to document and provide greater understanding of the economic impact of travel and tourism as a tool of economic development in rural and non-urban areas. In short, we believe that the proposed "Scenic Byways Study Act of 1989" represents an important first step toward achieving important national goals.

In promoting scenic byways, travel and tourism is also promoted. The travel and tourism industry is a proven dynamic and productive tool of economic development for our nation. Because of tourism, the nation's tax base has been vastly expanded. Taxes generated by travel and tourism increased by $2.4 billion over 1987. Because of tourism, new employment has been created. Over 417,000 new jobs were created directly and indirectly in the United States in 1988 through growth in the travel and tourism industry. Because of tourism, natural, historical and cultural sites have been preserved. And because of tourism, our export earnings, in the form of foreign visitor expenditures, have dramatically increased. Travel receipts from foreign visitor spending in the United States increased by $3.3 billion in 1988, making tourism the country's number one earner of export receipts.

This economic development from tourism, and scenic byways, is very important to nearly every region of the country, especially those that have suffered economic dislocation.

Protecting our nation's unique resource, the roads which bring into view the natural and cultural beauty and diversity of this nation will ensure that these roads are preserved and enhanced for generations to come.

We share your interest in highlighting the natural and cultural diversity of the United States. Again, thank you for this opportunity to express our support for scenic byways and this legislation and we look forward to working with you and your Subcommittee as the legislative process continues.

Sincerely,

Aubrey C. King

Aubrey C. King
Executive Director

II

101ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 432

To direct the Secretary of Transportation to identify scenic and historic roads and to develop methods of designating, promoting, protecting, and enhancing roads as scenic and historic roads.

---

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 22 (legislative day, JANUARY 3), 1989

Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. MOYNIHAN) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works

---

# A BILL

To direct the Secretary of Transportation to identify scenic and historic roads and to develop methods of designating, promoting, protecting, and enhancing roads as scenic and historic roads.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Scenic Byways Study Act of 1989".

## SEC. 2. FINDINGS, PURPOSE, AND POLICY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The President's Commission on Americans Outdoors of 1987 identified pleasure driving, sightseeing, and bicycling to view the historic, natural, and pastoral qualities offered by many of our Nation's roads as an important part of outdoor recreation for a majority of our population.

(2) Driving for pleasure is the second most popular form of outdoor recreation for Americans and sightseeing is third. Today, 77 percent of American adults drive for pleasure to view mountains, lakes, rushing streams, and historical structures, and for first-hand insights into the lifestyles of rural Americans.

(3) The Nation offers numerous regions through which people can travel to enjoy recreational, scenic, historic, and cultural sites. These corridors need to be identified and wisely managed so they may be enjoyed by future generations.

(4) The landscape and cultural qualities of scenic, recreation-rich, and historic routes throughout the country have not been consistently protected from visual and resource deterioration.

(5) Travel, tourism, and recreation have an important potential to contribute to the economic development of the Nation's rural and nonurban areas.

(6) A national program needs to be established to identify, designate, and promote scenic byways and to protect and enhance the recreational, scenic, historic, and cultural qualities of the areas through which these byways pass.

(b) PURPOSES.—It is the purpose of this Act—

(1) to assemble and update for the use of Congress in considering the establishment of a national scenic byways program a nationwide inventory of scenic byways using relevant materials developed by Federal, State, local, and private organizations, including those studies conducted pursuant to section 134 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973 and Executive Order 11017 (1962); and

(2) to develop recommendations for the establishment of a national scenic byways program, including recommended techniques for maintaining and enhancing the scenic, recreational, and historic qualities associated with each byway.

(c) POLICY.—It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to identify, designate, protect, and enhance, for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations, certain highways and roads which, with their immediate environments, possess unusually scenic, recreational, historic, cultural, or other similar values.

**SEC. 3. SCENIC BYWAYS PLAN.**

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare and transmit to Congress a nationwide, long-range plan for the identification, designation, promotion, protection, and enhancement of scenic and historic roads. The plan shall include, among others, the following elements:

(1) A report which includes a compilation and analysis of available studies regarding a national scenic byways program and several alternative proposed national scenic byways programs for Congress to examine.

(2) An updated inventory of scenic byways documenting to the extent possible the quality of each scenic corridor.

(3) Recommended guidelines for administration of a national scenic byways program and proposed minimum criteria for scenic byway designations. Such guidelines and criteria shall include measures to enhance the enjoyment and use of the scenic corridors as well as to avoid adverse safety and environmental consequences of expanded use of these corridors.

(4) Recommended techniques for enhancing the enjoyment and use of scenic byways as well as preserving and enhancing the scenic and historic qualities associated with each byway including scenic easements

and maintenance, rehabilitation, and improvements to scenic areas.

(5) Forecasts of significant changes in traffic volumes, safety consequences, and environmental and economic impacts associated with scenic byway designation.

(6) An estimate of the potential mileage to be included in a national scenic byways program and of the costs of carrying out such program.

## SEC. 4. ECONOMIC IMPACT AND TOURISM DEVELOPMENT.

(a) COLLECTION OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall assemble available information on economic activity associated with scenic and recreational travel, including but not limited to, case studies of existing scenic byways. The Secretary shall consult with other departments and agencies of the United States which may have relevant data.

(b) STUDY.—The Secretary shall also conduct a study and make recommendations—

(1) regarding economic impacts associated with the public identification and promotion of scenic byways as tourist attractions;

(2) regarding techniques for incorporating scenic byways into tourism development and marketing programs; and

(3) regarding alternative means to inform the public about scenic byways and about recreational, scenic, cultural, and historic sites and traveler services along such byways.

(c) DEADLINE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the information assembled under subsection (a) and the results of the study conducted under subsection (b).

**SEC. 5. CASE STUDIES.**

(a) STUDIES; ELEMENTS.—The Secretary, in consultation with other Federal agencies, shall conduct case studies of States with existing scenic byway programs. The purpose of the case studies shall be to examine the following issues on a case-by-case basis:

(1) Environmental impact of scenic byways, including impact of increased traffic.

(2) Impact on tourism and recreation.

(3) Standards or criteria used by the State to designate a road or highway as a scenic byway and the effectiveness of such standards and criteria.

(4) Methods of promoting scenic byways.

(5) The kinds of travelers' services along scenic byways.

(6) Techniques for protecting scenic and historic qualities of the scenic byway.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the case studies conducted under this section.

### SEC. 6. CONSULTATION AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT.

In carrying out the studies required by this Act, the Secretary shall cooperate and consult with the States and their political subdivisions, and interested private organizations, groups, and individuals and may conduct national and regional conferences to ensure broad public involvement.

### SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act—

(1) SCENIC BYWAY.—The term "scenic byway" means a highway or secondary road which passes through scenic, cultural, recreational, or historic landscapes.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Transportation.

### SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATION.

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act $1,000,000.

○